272.05 W-86 42065

Woodstock Letters

Vol 97 (1968)

272.05 W-86 42065

272.05
W-86

DATE DUE

MAR 27	4		
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

SUMMER 1968

Volume 97 Number 3

INTRODUCTION

We devote most of this issue to comment, past and present, on the interracial apostolate of the Society of Jesus. Besides Father General, six other Jesuits and a layman comment on what has been and has to be done. Copy Editor **Richard A. Blake, S.J.**, is responsible for the assembly and editing of the symposium.

In line with the interracial apostolate theme, we also present a biography of John Markoe, S.J., one of the two great American Jesuits in interracial work. **Robert T. Reilly**, a friend of Fr. Markoe and a sixteen year administrator at Creighton in Omaha, narrates the remarkable life.

Analysis of last year's Santa Clara Conference on Total Formation as well as some personal reminiscence is given by **Justin J. Kelly, S. J.**, just finished Tertianship in Wales. A book by Clement J. McNaspy, S. J., of *America*, another Conference participant, has been published; it uses Santa Clara as a suggestive guideline for religious renewal. **Francis P. Valentino, S. J.**, just ordained, reviews it in this issue.

Ignatian Survey: 1967, is ably edited by WOODSTOCK LETTERS' out-of-town correspondent, **Robert C. Collins, S. J.**, who is studying at Union Theological in New York.

CONTENTS

SUMMER 1968

INTRODUCTION

289 JESUITS AND THE INTERRACIAL APOSTOLATE • *edited by Richard A. Blake. Contributors: Peter Arrupe, S.J., Albert P. Bartlett, S.J., Anthony A. Croce, S.J., Edward G. Winner, Philip S. Hurley, S.J., Robert E. McEwen, S.J., Richard T. McSorley, S.J., Leo J. Gafney, S.J., John Courtney Murray, S.J.*

361 HE SAVED US FROM SCANDAL: JOHN MARKOE, S.J. • *Robert T. Reilly*

367 THE SANTA CLARA CONFERENCE: REFLECTIONS AND REMINISCENCE • *Justin J. Kelly, S.J.*

384 IGNATIAN SURVEY: 1967 • *Robert C. Collins, S.J., ed.*

394 HOW TO GET RID OF HISTORY • *John W. O'Malley, S.J.*

REVIEWS

413 POSTCONCILIAR PARISH • *Francis J. Tierney, S.J.*

417 CHANGE FOR RELIGIOUS • *Francis P. Valentino, S.J.*

420 CHURCH AGAINST ITSELF • *Joseph F. Roccasalvo, S.J.*

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

WOODSTOCK LETTERS solicits manuscripts from all Jesuits on all topics of particular interest to fellow Jesuits: Ignatian spirituality, the activities of our various apostolates, problems facing the modern Society, and the history of the Society, particularly in the United States and its missions. In general it is our policy to publish major obituary articles on men whose work would be of interest to the whole assistancy.

Letters of comment and criticism will be welcomed for the Readers' Forum.

Manuscripts, preferably the original copy, should be double-spaced with ample margins. Whenever possible, contributors of articles on Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit history should follow the stylistic norms of the Institute of Jesuit Sources. These are most conveniently found in Supplementary Notes B and C and in the list of abbreviations in Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. W. J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 609–16.

STAFF

Published by the faculty and students of Woodstock College. *Editor*: Edward J. Mally, S. J./*Managing Editor*: Gerard C. Reedy, S. J./*Copy Editor*: Richard A. Blake, S. J./*Associate Editors*: Robert C. Collins, S. J., James P. Jurich, S. J., Raymond A. Schroth, S. J., R. Emmett Curran, S. J., Kenneth J. DeLuca, S. J., Edward T. Dowling, S. J., Peter D. Fordi, S. J., Patrick H. Samway, S. J., James F. Donnelly, S. J., Richard R. Galligan, S. J., Joseph J. Papaj, S. J./*Business Manager*: Paul L. Horgan, S. J.

JESUITS AND THE INTERRACIAL APOSTOLATE

Edited by Richard A. Blake, s.j.

Jesuit involvement in race relations is not new; its history is marked by Peter Claver and John LaFarge. It is marked as well by slave holdings and segregated schools. Through the centuries our treatment of the Negro in this country has been conditioned by the times; we were no better and no worse—and this perhaps is a terrible indictment. Since World War II and the nightmare experience of Hitler's racism, the race issue has risen to the surface in our own country. Jesuits in committee rooms and coffee rooms have heard varied voices: threatened voices denouncing agitation and violence, cautious voices warning against moving too fast, and enthusiastic voices urging a sweeping revision of all our traditional apostolates in this country.

We have passed beyond the age of complacency and the age of enthusiasm. Integrating our schools, we have found, is scarcely an adequate response to the problem, since ghettos produce few students to meet our normal standards for academic excellence. A mass investment of men and money in the inner city cannot provide a solution, since our resources are insignificant when compared to the effort of the government. We Jesuits then confront a problem of immense complexity, involving perhaps a complete re-

structuring of the Society; clear answers and objectives have not yet appeared. In the midst of this confusion, Father General has endorsed a letter to the American Jesuits on The Interracial Apostolate.

Several Jesuits and their associates in interracial work were asked by WOODSTOCK LETTERS *to comment on this letter. Their response both to the letter and to Jesuit interracial work in general is largely negative. Administrative directives, such as the decrees of Vatican II or our own 31st General Congregation, are seldom completely satisfactory to men in the field. Such documents are rather a summing up of where the organization stands at present; they are a summary of points that the rank and file can agree upon; seldom, if ever, do administrators canonize by directive the hopeful expectations of the most progressive elements of the organization. Further, our performance in the past has left grave doubts of our ability to switch tactics on a large scale—the endless procession of committees and discussions seems to leave our basic ministries untouched. Those who have experienced first hand the frustrations and delays of administrative machinery may be excused their emotion; their impatience is in itself an important element in their message.*

Following these responses to Father General's letter is an edited memorandum from Fr. John Courtney Murray to Father Assistant, Zacheus Maher. Quite possibly the years since 1945 would have altered some aspects of Fr. Murray's thinking on interracial morality, but his memorandum, despite the limitations of its age, still provides a valuable analysis of the central issues; in many respects his thinking was quite prophetic.

This collection of statements was left completely open; in all cases the editing was minimal and consequently the opinions expressed are solely those of the contributors. The text numbers were added to Father General's letter to facilitate reference from the commentaries. In the interest of ongoing dialogue, our Readers' Forum invites further reflections on Jesuit involvement in the interracial apostolate.

The Interracial Apostolate

Peter Arrupe, S.J.

1) The gravity of the current racial crisis in the United States and its serious impact upon Christian doctrine and practice impel me to address this letter to you. I do so with a great sense of responsibility and after consultation with the American Provincials and other men knowledgeable in the field of race relations. The problem is urgent and complicated. It is not easy to put into writing what I would like to say to you, but I know you will read my words in the spirit in which they are written.

2) The racial crisis involves, before all else, a direct challenge to our sincerity in professing a Christian concept of man. Upon our response and that of like-minded men to this challenge will depend the extent to which the solution of the crisis will bear a Christian character. And this in turn will determine whether the crisis will develop into a great human achievement or a great human failure.

3) For the first time in their tragic history of constitutional slavery, of legal segregation, and now of social discrimination, the great body of American Negroes, with growing self-respect and self-reliance, are giving convincing signs of their determination to gain their rightful status as men and as full-fledged citizens. The successful pursuit of this objective will redound to the enduring credit not only of the Negro, but of all who struggle with him for the realization of human equality. On the other hand, if resistance on the part of a hostile white community, with extreme reaction on the part of more militant Negroes, defeats this effort, not only will an historic opportunity be lost, but a permanent fracture in the structure of national life will become an awesome possibility.

4) In the presence of such a crisis, the resources of upright men must be marshalled to insure that the rich potentialities of the movement for human rights be not squandered in destructive conflict. At this moment of desperate human need what is the role of

the Society of Jesus in her service to the Church and in her fidelity to the spirit of the Second Vatican Council? Is it not to inspire her sons so to labor, in cooperation with men of good will, as to make all phases of American institutions and practices an environment in which the human dignity and rights of all will be acknowledged, respected and protected?

Race and poverty

5) Race relations and poverty are not necessarily and everywhere two aspects of the same problem. But, as a matter of fact, in the United States the problem of racial discrimination can hardly be considered apart from the problem of poverty. For it is especially among the hundreds of thousands of racially exploited that the poignant description of the poor by my predecessor, Fr. John Baptist Janssens, in his *Instruction on the Social Apostolate*, October 10, 1949, is distressingly verified.

6) In that Instruction, Fr. Janssens pleaded with us Jesuits to understand:

> what it means to spend a whole life in humble circumstances, to be a member of the lowest class of mankind, to be ignored and looked down upon by other men; to be unable to appear in public because one does not have decent clothes or the proper social training; to be the means by which others grow rich; to live from day to day on nothing but the most frugal food, and never to be certain about the morrow; to be forced to work either below or above one's strength, amid every danger to health, honor and purity of soul; to be unemployed for days and months, tormented by idleness and want; to be unable to bring up one's children in a decent manner, but rather to be forced to expose them to the common dangers of the public streets, to disease and suffering; to mourn many of them who, lacking the tender care which they need, have been snatched off by death in the bloom of their youth; never to enjoy any decent recreation of soul or body; and at the same time to behold about one the very men for whom one works, abounding in riches, enjoying superfluous comforts, devoting themselves to liberal studies and the fine arts, loaded with honors, authority and praise.

7) The poor are rightfully demanding fair participation in the benefits of scientific and technological progress. They are seeking earnestly for leaders who will enable them to secure their just share of the earth's bounty—leaders who will deliver them from the misery of perennial poverty and free them to live in the fullness of human dignity. If, in this revolution of rising expectations, they cannot find in the free world the sympathy and the help they

need, they may be tempted to turn to other leaders and to other systems inimical to Christian truths and democratic ideals.

American problem

8) The riots and bloodshed accompanying racial strife in the United States have given us grim forewarning of the danger lurking in the land unless effective measures are taken, quickly and sincerely, to eradicate racial injustice and grinding poverty.

9) The principal groups upon whom the pressures of discrimination and poverty bear most heavily are the Negroes in every section of the country, the Mexican-Americans in the Southwest, the Puerto Ricans clustered largely in such cities as New York and Chicago, the American Indians living for the most part on reservations in the West, and the migratory workers who follow the crops according to seasonal demands. Because the Negro minority is the largest and most tragic victim, and is at the center of domestic concern, I will place special emphasis upon Negro-white relations, conscious of the fact that much of what I say is applicable to other groups victimized by discrimination and poverty.

10) The United States enjoys an acknowledged position in the free world. The nation, therefore, carries a heavy responsibility to solve its problems of discrimination and poverty within its own borders in order that its efforts to contribute to their solution in other parts of the world be not mistrusted.

American ideals

11) Americans take justifiable pride in the political and moral philosophy enunciated in the *Declaration of Independence* of 1776: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The *Declaration* referred expressly to God, to the Creator, to the Supreme Judge of the World, and expressly committed the young nation to his Divine Providence. We rightly rejoice in this solemn deliberate affirmation of the politico-religious faith of the American people. But this politico-religious faith was not enough. These ideals were not self-executing. Racism spread throughout the body politic, both North and South.

12) In God's Providence, however, a new and hopeful era in

race relations has now dawned. The Supreme Court of the United States, in its justly famous decision in the school segregation cases, May 17, 1954, and in subsequent supporting decisions, has clearly and consistently held that compulsory racial segregation is irreconcilable with "equal protection of the laws," and that every statute, official policy or official act of racial discrimination is unconstitutional. In so deciding, the Court has manifested its humility, its courage and its perseverance in the relentless pursuit of American ideals.

13) Following the leadership of the Supreme Court, the national Congress has recently enacted a number of laws, within its federal jurisdiction, to protect civil rights against racial discrimination and to foster equal economic opportunities among persons of all races. Moreover, many of the States, within their own legislative competence, have enacted antidiscrimination statutes in the fields of education, public accommodations, employment and housing. These are all hopeful and heartening advances in the long and painful struggle for interracial justice and charity.

14) I have alluded to the difficulties in the progress of race relations, from the *Declaration of Independence* to the present day, to point out a vital historical lesson. Principle does not guarantee practice. And this is true, not only of political principle, but of religious principle as well. For racism in all its ugly manifestations, whether by compulsion of unconstitutional statutes or by force of un-Christian practices, whether in public life or in private life, is objectively a moral and religious evil. As such, it can never be solved adequately by civil laws or civil courts. It must also be solved in the consciences of men. American Jesuits cannot, must not, stand aloof.

Religious ideals

15) The ideals of the *Declaration of Independence*, of human freedom and equality under God, are contained in the theology of the Church Universal. The dignity of human personality, the unity of the human race and the equality of all men are of the very essence of the Christian Gospel, which proclaims our common origin, our common purpose, our common redemption and our common destiny. These fundamental truths of our Faith demand and inspire supernatural love for every human being as a son of

the Father and as a brother in Christ; and, therefore, our supernatural zeal for interracial justice and charity. Hence, if we make a distinction between Negro and white and, on the basis of that distinction, act as though we owe the Negro something less in justice and charity than the white man, we do violence to the Christian concept of man.

16) Certainly it is unnecessary for me, in writing to my fellow Jesuits, to dwell at length upon the teachings of the Church concerning interracial justice and charity. These teachings are well known to you. Pope Paul VI, on October 29, 1967, stated: "The Second Vatican Council clearly and repeatedly condemned racism in its various forms as being an offence against human dignity, 'foreign to the mind of Christ' and 'contrary to God's intent.'" The Holy Father was referring particularly to the following passage in the *Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions:*

> We cannot in truthfulness call upon that God who is the Father of us all if we refuse to act in a brotherly way toward certain men, created as they are to God's image. A man's relationship with God the Father and his relationship with his brother men are so linked together that Scripture says: "He who does not love does not know God" (I Jn. 4:8).
>
> The ground is therefore removed from every theory or practice which leads to a distinction between men or peoples in the matter of human dignity and the rights which flow from it.
>
> As a consequence, the Church rejects as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against men or harassment of them because of their race, color, condition of life, or religion.

17) Concerning racial conditions in the United States, the American hierarchy in its 1958 statement on *Discrimination and the Christian Conscience* emphasized the fact that "the heart of the race problem is moral and religious." In concluding, the Bishops said:

> For this reason we hope and earnestly pray that responsible and sober-minded Americans of all religious faiths, in all areas of our land, will seize the mantle of leadership from the agitator and the racist. It is vital that we act now and act decisively. All men must act quietly, courageously, and prayerfully before it is too late.
>
> For the welfare of our nation, we call upon all to root out from their hearts bitterness and hatred. The tasks we face are indeed difficult. But hearts in-

spired by Christian love will surmount these difficulties.
Clearly, then, these problems are vital and urgent. May God give this nation the grace to meet the challenge it faces. For the sake of generations of future Americans, and indeed for all humanity, we cannot fail.

18) The truths of our Faith, the teachings of the Second Vatican Council, the statements of the American hierarchy, are clear and compelling. Wherefore a critical question immediately arises: has the historical reluctance of American citizens to implement the *Declaration of Independence* been sadly paralleled by a corresponding reluctance of our Society to implement the fullness of Christian doctrine?

19) It is chastening to recall that, before the Civil War, some American Jesuit houses owned Negro slaves. It is humbling to remember that, until recently, a number of Jesuit institutions did not admit qualified Negroes, even in areas where civil restrictions against integrated schools did not prevail, and this even in the case of Catholic Negroes. It is embarrassing to note that, up to the present, some of our institutions have effected what seems to be little more than token integration of the Negro. It is salutary for us to reflect upon these facts.

20) It is true, of course, that in the history of the American Assistancy, Jesuits have distinguished themselves in laboring faithfully and effectively with many minority groups. We in the United States have a long and proud record of work with the American Indian, and with the Irish, the Italian, the German and the Slav immigrants of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. At the present time Jesuits are prominently identified with the Puerto Rican apostolate in the New York metropolitan area, and Jesuit activity for the Mexican-Americans in El Paso is worthy of special commendation.

21) Nevertheless, our record of service to the American Negro has fallen far short of what it should have been. Indeed of recent years, there have been great pioneers like Frs. John LaFarge and John Markoe, and others who followed them. These American Jesuits, despite misunderstanding and even opposition, sometimes within the Society itself, have accomplished heroic things in their work with the Negro. But unfortunately our apostolate to the Negro in the United States has depended chiefly upon individual

initiative and very little upon a corporate effort of the Society. In the era of mass immigration from Europe to the United States, our men gave outstanding service to the exploited poor, to whom they were bound by ethnic and religious ties. But in the intervening decades, as the immigrant groups advanced economically, educationally, politically and socially, the Society of Jesus tended to become identified more and more with the middle-class, white segment of the population.

Why so little involvement?

22) It would be wholesome practice for each of us, individually and as members of Jesuit communities, to examine our consciences and to inquire why so little of our effort in the past has been expended in work for and with the Negro. Permit me to suggest some possible answers: a failure to appreciate fully the practical implications of the Christian concept of man; an uncritical acceptance of certain stereotypes and prejudices regarding the Negro, acquired in youth and not effectively eradicated by the training in the Society; the insulation of far too many Jesuits from the actual living conditions of the poor, and hence of most Negroes; an unconscious conformity to the discriminatory thought and action patterns of the surrounding white community; an unarticulated fear of the reprisals sometimes visited on those who participate in the active Negro apostolate; the mistaken notion that, since other priests and religious are serving the Negro, we may exempt ourselves from the obligation of contributing a major effort to the struggle for interracial justice and charity; a lack of sufficient comprehension that, while the Society of Jesus is committed to the service of all mankind, it is especially committed to the service of Christ's poor. Other considerations will undoubtedly suggest themselves to you from your own study and personal experience.

23) At the present time, however, I am happy to observe among us a quickening pace of apostolic concern for the Negro. Opportunities now being provided, particularly for the younger men throughout the Assistancy, to become personally involved in direct action with the Negro, are heartening signs that American Jesuits are becoming more aware of their Christian obligations. Moreover, the frequent public lectures on the race problem by Jesuits, the

numerous articles on interracial justice in Jesuit publications, the growing stress on racial matters in the curricular and extra-curricular activities of Jesuit high schools, colleges and universities, are additional signs of this increasing awareness.

24) Nevertheless, when past and present accomplishments in the interracial apostolate are duly acknowledged, it remains true that the Society of Jesus has not committed its manpower and other resources to that apostolate in any degree commensurate with the need of the Negro to share in our services. The considerably less than sufficient social performance of our Jesuit scholasticates, parishes, retreat houses, high schools, colleges and universities, can be summed up in our past failure adequately to realize, to preach, to teach and to practice the Christian truths of interracial justice and charity, according to our Jesuit vocation.

The spirit of poverty

25) We must look to the future. First of all, our apostolate must be soundly predicated upon our personal and collective testimony to the real poverty of Christ. The needs of the world and the condition of the poor constitute a mandate and an incentive to remodel our own living standards. Ignatian love of poverty should inspire us so to act "that our entire apostolate is informed with the spirit of poverty."

26) Before turning to others for assistance, is it not time for us to reconsider ways and means of reducing our personal and community expenses and thereby to assist and to identify ourselves with Christ's poor? I am confident that your traditional kindness and generosity will not fail in this regard. It will be a test of our sincerity in loving the poor Christ. "What does it profit, my brethren, if a man says he has faith but has not works? Can his faith save him? If a brother or sister is ill-clad and in lack of daily food, and one of you says to them, 'Go in peace, be warmed and filled,' without giving them the things needed for the body, what does it profit? So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead" (James 2: 14–17).

Jesuit policies

27) Lest my letter appear to be a mere enunciation of general principles and adverse criticism, I deem it advisable to draw up the following directives as indicative of the course which Jesuit

thought and action should take in attacking the twin evils of racial injustice and poverty in the United States.

a) In coordination with the sociological survey now in progress, the provincials with their consultors, and local superiors with their communities, should seriously reassess their ministries, manpower and other resources, in order to discover how their potential can be focused most effectively upon the grave problems of race and poverty. This potential should then be utilized, vigorously and courageously, in the service of Christ's poor.

b) All our younger brethren should be thoroughly trained, from the novitiate onward, in the principles of social justice and charity. Accordingly, with proper regard for the demands of their academic formation, priests, scholastics and brothers should be given the opportunity to gain personal experience in confronting the practical problems of the inner city and of racial discrimination. Superiors should bear in mind the necessity of developing genuine experts in race relations.

c) The fact that there are extremely few Negro Jesuits in the United States is a cause of concern. Negro vocations should not only be conscientiously fostered but, if necessary, special opportunities should be given to Negroes to prepare themselves for entrance into the Society.

d) In explaining Christian doctrine, we should teach interracial justice and charity as an integral and vital part of our Catholic faith and commitment. In all our ministries, practices reflecting a pattern of racial segregation or discrimination, however subtle or pragmatic, should be totally eliminated.

e) In high schools, colleges and universities, we should make increased efforts to encourage the enrollment of qualified Negroes, and the establishment of special programs to assist disadvantaged Negroes to meet admission standards; special scholarship funds and other financial assistance should be solicited for this purpose. We should use our influence to conduct or sponsor conferences, seminars, workshops, lectures and the like, concerning such problems as open-occupancy housing, equal-employment opportunity, merit promotion, health services, sanitation conditions, and urban rehabilitation. We should urge the establishment in colleges and universities of institutes of human relations and of urban affairs,

by means of which such institutions can become intimately involved, through research and action programs, with the renewal of the metropolitan areas in which they are located. As is being done in many places, specific programs involving students in personal contact with, and in personal service to the people of the inner city, should be promoted as recognized extra-curricular activities. Moreover, serious consideration should be given to the feasibility of permitting Jesuits to teach on the faculties of Negro colleges and of inner-city high schools. Finally, we should use our influence that qualified Negroes be recruited for services on the faculties and administrative staffs of Jesuit institutions.

f) In our parishes we should earnestly strive with our parishioners to make the Negro genuinely welcome, and to help him participate in every way in the fullness of parish life. The Christian doctrine of social justice and charity, with specific applications to the race problem, should be a frequent subject in our pulpits.

g) In our retreat houses the Spiritual Exercises should be conducted in such a way as to promote social as well as individual morality, and thus to inculcate integral Christianity. This approach is of great importance since many, if not most, of our retreatants are in a position to advance or to retard the development of social justice and charity in the professions, in business, in labor unions, in politics and in general public acceptance. It is hardly necessary to repeat that a racially segregated admission policy cannot be tolerated, for any reason, in any of our retreat houses.

h) In our sodality work we should make special efforts to inspire our sodalists with apostolic zeal to break down the un-Christian barriers of racial prejudice and discrimination, and to undertake specific action programs to deepen their commitment and to increase their effectiveness in this apostolate.

i) In the signing of contracts for the purchase of goods and services, we should take particular precautions to patronize only those business firms and construction companies which have adopted, and actually observe, the canons of fair employment practices.

j) We should seek to cooperate with the many efforts being made by sincere, intelligent and courageous people, Catholic and

non-Catholic, believer and nonbeliever, who are making substantial contributions to the cause of interracial justice and charity. Therefore, as circumstances indicate, we should be at the service of such organizations as the diocesan commissions on human relations, the diocesan interracial councils, and the various interfaith and non-religious groups which are laboring devotedly and effectively for this common objective.

Practical programs

28) In addition to these more general directives, and in order to increase their effectiveness, I wish to indicate a specific procedure. In the near future, the fathers provincial will appoint advisors in each province whose duty it will be to draw up, in the light of provincial and community discussions, specific recommendations as to how each province or region can best respond to the general directives above. The resulting recommendations should be submitted to the provincials before their 1968 Spring meeting.

29) Among these recommendations, I suggest, first, that there be a report on the practicality of establishing with ecclesiastical approval a separate Jesuit residence in a poor Negro section of one or more of the major cities in each province. Those who would live in such a house would be prepared to lead lives of poverty accommodated to their neighborhood, in order to make the humble and poor Christ present among those whom they serve and among whom they live.

30) Secondly, there would be a proposal on the feasibility of appointing a full-time Director of the Interracial Apostolate for each province or region.

31) Those who would be assigned to the interracial apostolate should be prepared for it by intensive training courses in the particular problems of the inner-city. Thus they would be conditioned intellectually and psychologically to meet with understanding and compassion the spiritual and material needs of the poor.

32) It would be my hope that such inner-city residences would be in actual operation before the end of 1968.

Conclusion

33) In closing allow me to assure you that I understand clearly the difficult challenge which faces us. I recognize that some will

have to re-examine their racial attitudes and bring them into conformity with the teachings of the Church. I realize further that the apostolate I have outlined may arouse adverse reactions in some quarters outside the Society. I am aware of the possibility of a lessening of financial assistance to the ministries in which we are now engaged. I know that the faithful exercise of this new ministry will require deep dedication and persevering zeal. Courage of a high supernatural order will be indispensable for the sacrifices we must make in realigning our manpower and resources to meet the crying needs of our brothers in Christ who languish in racial degradation and inhuman poverty.

34) But in the zealous and persevering labors of this apostolate there will be the great consolation of hastening a new era in which all men will have well-founded hope of living in the fullness of their God-given dignity. In meeting this challenge we will bear living and visible witness to the validity, the integrity, the credibility and the relevance of the Christian message, in a world increasingly skeptical of the sincerity of Christians, if not of Christianity itself.

35) Finally, we Jesuits must be convinced that our work in the interracial apostolate will be effective only to the extent that it is transfused with the spirit of Him who said: "By this will all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love, one for another."

Devotedly in Christ,

Peter Arrupe, S.J.
General of the Society of Jesus

November 1, 1967

I

Rector's Statement to the Trustees of McQuaid Jesuit High School

Albert P. Bartlett, S.J.
Rector

"So, you're going to admit niggers to McQuaid? Well, you can forget my contribution to McQuaid!" That was the first reaction I heard to the newspaper announcement that the McQuaid Jesuits will muster forces and resources to help the Negro in Rochester.

Perhaps that shallow, shrunken view comes from having known the Negro only at a distance—in a sentimental way—in the radio skits of "Amos n' Andy"—in the humorous scenes of Marc Connolly's *Green Pastures*, in the poignant melodies of Jerome Kern's *Showboat*, in the memorable lyrics of Stephen Foster's songs, in the pages of Mark Twain, Booth Tarkington, and Harriet Beecher Stowe, in the poems of William Blake and Langston Hughes, in the films of Sidney Poitier, or in the portraits of Grandma Moses. Perhaps we've sung the Negro's spirituals, but never shared his sorrows. It was Emerson who observed that the American who has made the greatest happiness from the least resources is the Negro.

The second reaction I heard to our resolve no longer to remain aloof, was, "There's a limit to what you guys can do. Priests are getting too involved." Involved in what? Involved in the challenge to American sincerity. Response to this challenge can result in the greatest American achievement. Rejection of it will result in the greatest American failure. We are faced with the fusion or the fraction of America. We can capture the rich potential of the Civil Rights movement, or, we can squander it in destructive conflict. We are on the verge of a vital decision—to choose between those two alternatives. Will we put a white man on the moon, before we put a Negro on the earth—where he belongs—in a climate of equality, not on the fringes of society?

Can we call ourselves Christian and ignore the equal dignity of the Negro? Can we call ourselves American, and ignore the *Declaration of Independence*, the supreme court decision, and Congressional legislation? The issues of racial discrimination and pov-

erty are no longer matters political and social. They are deeply moral and religious. They will be solved not in the courts but in the consciences of men.

We Jesuits cannot and will not stand aloof. It is time in this community of Rochester that lethargy yielded to leadership. That leadership will be marked by racism and agitation, or by genuine compassion and concern. We must act decisively, and we must act now.

We Jesuits are not newcomers to the life of the Negro. For to England belongs the credit for beginning the abolition of slave trade, in 1815. But to England also belongs the discredit, in the person of the 16th century Sir John Hawkins, of that sullied chapter of human history, the slave trade between Africa and America. But from the Spaniards, on whom the English looked as unscrupulous, buccaneering imperialists, or fantastically cruel inquisitors, came the Jesuit who became the greatest friend of the Negro, Fr. Peter Claver, S.J. This "Saint of the Slave Trade," as Arnold Lunn called him, devoted his whole life to the Negro victims of nefarious exploitation and diabolical indifference.

At Cartagena, Colombia, Fr. Claver watched Negroes, bought for $1.50 and sold for $150.00, land at the rate of 10,000 a year, living freight, unloaded, herded like cattle, and shut up in yards and sheds. One third of them had died in voyage. The rest Fr. Claver revived with brandy and bread he had collected. Claver spoke to them with his hands because he couldn't talk to them with his tongue. He taught them, 300,000 of them in 40 years, with simple pictures and with kindness. Pope Leo XIII, in the year of the great blizzard, 1888, canonized Fr. Claver, and made him patron of all work for Negroes. That was a glorious chapter in the Jesuits' compassion for the Negro.

Yet, it is chastening, as Father General Arrupe reminds us, to realize that Jesuits in this country owned slaves, and that Jesuit schools refused Negro students. Yet, the first president of Georgetown University, Fr. Healy, was a Negro. As late as 1945, when I was at St. Louis University, Frs. Dunn and Heithaus were removed from the University faculty because of their zeal for the cause of the Negro. Then the great Cardinal Ritter came to the city, and changed the course of history for the Negro in St. Louis.

The words of Father General are a ringing challenge to return to the mind of St. Peter Claver and his consuming love for the disadvantaged Negro: "We understand the difficulty of the challenge. We know our alliance with the Negro will arouse adverse reactions. We know it may lessen the financial assistance given to us. But, we accept that challenge. We will meet the crying needs of our fellow men who languish in racial degradation, and who live in subhuman poverty. We will meet this challenge in the face of those who in other countries, are increasingly skeptical of the sincerity of Americans" (33–34).

One of my former students made that historic trip to Selma, Alabama. He described for me his experiences. One remains fixed in my mind. Along the march, an eight year old Negro boy made a belittling remark to a white trooper. The trooper chased the lad, followed him into a Baptist church, cornered him, and gave him a choice: "Be bull-whipped, or leap through that stained-glass window." The trembling boy jumped through the church window, tearing his young Negro flesh to shreds, and there the trooper left him, in bleeding pain. That's how low America can stoop.

The time has come, to see how high America can rise, to see how well America can hear! "A man was beaten, robbed, ditched, and dying. Priest and levite passed him by. Then, someone stopped, first-aided him, horsed him, hotel-ed him. Lord, who is my neighbor? Who?"

II

My People The Slum

Anthony A. Croce
Doctoral Student in Sociology, Fordham University

Mr. and Mrs. Hector Rodriguez speak perfect English, as do their two children. They live on the ground floor because Hector is the building superintendent. Mrs. Rodriguez is active on the advisory board of the anti-poverty project on the block; she is expecting her third child. Above them live a wonderfully noisy family of farm people recently arrived from Puerto Rico. The father

now does seasonal gardening on Long Island. And so it goes, up to the sixth floor of the tenement. The living rooms are usually clean; the families keep a close watch over their children.

Down Eldridge Street live Mr. and Mrs. Jim Robinson. Originally from the deep South, they have no children. A walk around the corner, past the cooperative grocery store started by men of the community, and two flights up, finds us with Mrs. Emily Yong whose portly frame fills the threshold. Her apartment is smaller than most, but clean. Her daughter, Brigid, smiles with her oriental eyes and disappears into the tiny bedroom to do the homework which the sisters assigned her at Immaculate Conception School.

They typify the community, these Puerto Rican, Negro, and Chinese Americans. They and their children make the streets around Nativity Mission Center jump with life day and night. The playground swings never cease their groaning. The people are unified, of course, in their common problem: the men don't make enough money. Sixty dollars a week is average; eighty is considered good. Hector Rodriguez puts together two jobs and manages to bring home about $120. He's considered one of the better off of the law-abiding. To make more he would have to break the law.

They live on several short blocks of Manhattan's lower east side. They are New York's poor. They are also today's political dynamite, powerful enough to create an Economic Opportunity Act, and to attract a group of Jesuits to their community. But let's not run ahead of our story. Let's not talk yet about the priests and programs brought down to the neighborhood to "help people in need," or about the "urban blight" of this "inner city slum." Let's not yet refer to Mr. and Mrs. Rodriguez, Mr. and Mrs. Robinson and Mrs. Yong as an "inner city slum."

Life in the neighborhood can be tricky. Parents have to keep the kids away from the dope addicts on Allen Street and the alcoholics across the playground on Chrystie Street and the Bowery. They also have to keep them interested in school. And they must guide the dating habits of the teenagers. Then, of course, some people in the community are a problem, like Mr. Maton who doesn't take proper care of his little Carmelo, or Mrs. Pavo who is so nervous herself and keeps such a terribly tight reign on her two daughters. People say it was the mother's fault that the daugh-

ter cut her wrists one day, but people are human anywhere you find them. Eldridge Street is no exception.

Sensational things occur from time to time. These are the kind of events that are written about when someone is asking for more anti-poverty funds or when a magazine needs an article on America's deteriorating slums. In two years time, for example, the residents of Eldridge Street learned that Bernie participated in a candy store holdup in which the owner was shot to death; that José died from a heroin overdose; that half a dozen of our teenage boys are facing rape charges because one of the neighborhood girls insisted on going up alone to the stag party where the boys were high on beer; that after Mr. Hassa passed away Mrs. Hassa became mentally unbalanced and the four children sometimes have to make their own corn flakes for supper; that young Jesús is being mistaken for a Negro now that he's begun looking for jobs; that Seward Park High School now houses three times its capacity in students and the extension building that was promised four years ago hasn't been begun yet; and that there are certain criminal careers available to bright and ambitious neighborhood people which pay very handsomely, even though they may involve you indirectly with the well-dressed gentlemen from Mott and Mulberry Streets. If you're not so bright but still have a spark of ambition, Mulberry Street might get you some boxing matches in Madison Square Garden, which you will lose, like Pedro, and if you're lucky you won't break your jaw twice, unlike Pedro.

My two years of regency at Nativity taught me that the lower class community has its own inner strength. They are not a deteriorating people, they are not in need of rehabilitation, they are not morally or psychologically sick. They are strong, vigorous, ambitious and desperately in need of legitimate avenues along which to channel their ambition. The brightest and best young men sometimes get so restless that they go into crime simply because it is the only occupation they see in which they have a chance of getting ahead and improving themselves. After working at Nativity, I can appreciate the uninhibited, self-confident pride of the Negro community today, with its Black Nationalist and Black Power exponents. Perhaps what we are witnessing is the suddenly activated potential of the Negro community to rejuvenate

itself. But a walk through Newark at night would convince most white men that the Negroes there neither need nor will accept emissaries from the white world who come to rehabilitate individual ghetto residents, even if those emissaries happen to work out of a parish rectory. Today's urban poor do not need more missionaries; they need new opportunities.

As seen through the eyes of the Eldridge Street community, then, the Jesuits came in several phases. The first phase began before anyone can remember and consisted of the parish priests whom the people saw as men baptizing the children, marrying the young couples, and occasionally helping to get a more reasonable price for a funeral when Mr. Ortiz wanted to charge too much. The second phase was Fr. Janer. Around him grew the Mission Center where the kids played pool and joined clubs and went to camp in the summer, and where the sisters taught catechism to prepare them for first communion. But that was all before the civil rights movement and Vatican II. Something happened to the Jesuits after those two events.

The people on Eldridge Street knew from television and the newspapers and from the Negroes in the community that the civil rights movement had started. Once there was an office run by CORE on Allen Street, which taught people to organize for their own interests. Some people did, but the CORE office soon closed. The people thought vaguely that Mobilization For Youth also had something to do with the civil rights movement. Whenever the Negroes in some city rioted, the Puerto Ricans talked badly about them. But in their hearts, they wanted to riot too; when it got the chance, "El Barrio" in the Bronx did riot, with much merriment.

Fordham-Nativity project

The third phase of Jesuits to hit the neighborhood consisted of a "team." The Jesuits of the team said they had a project called the Fordham-Nativity Project. These men were stirred by civil rights and by Vatican II, for they said they were going to start social action as well as a new form of parish life with all the new theology.

The people liked these men because they were friendly. Some said it was too bad that the Jesuits' project didn't work out. The Jesuits all seemed disappointed when the project stopped. Two

of them stayed for a long time to work at the Mission Center and one of these became the Center's director.

That, roughly, is the story as seen through the eyes of the Eldridge Street community. My experiences at Nativity cover twenty-two months from August, 1965 to June, 1967, beginning with the Fordham-Nativity venture and continuing at the Mission Center and its anti-poverty project for a year and a half after that venture's end.

Let's first ask, why did the Fordham-Nativity Project fail? Was it simply a clash of personalities between the project team and the parish priests? I only wish it were that simple, but I have an uneasy suspicion that the cause of the failure lies much deeper.

Parish work, as carried out at Nativity since the first half of the 19th century, had been an apostolate to the poor immigrants. As such, it involved the Jesuits in a complicated process of assisting minority groups to assimilate to the dominant American culture. The Jesuits were noted for their sympathy toward the minority cultures; they spoke the foreign languages and were conversant with the etiquette and values of the minority communities. But the Church itself, as an organization in the neighborhood, was seen by the Jesuits as occupying a place midway between the dominant and the minority communities. The function of Nativity was to allow the immigrants to pass through it on their way to more affluent parishes uptown. In the opinion of Nativity's parish priests, their function consisted of non-partisan mediation between the interests of the minority groups and the already available opportunities of the dominant society. A parish was not considered the proper organization for engaging in conflicts to restructure the shape of the dominant society.

If an opportunity for a job or an apartment was available in the dominant society, the Jesuits would urge the people to take advantage of it. Occasionally, when a competition was declared such as hearings of the housing commission or the budget hearings of the Board of Education, the Jesuits would encourage Nativity's residents to participate in the contest, fighting against other minority interest groups for possession of the limited goods and services which the dominant society was making available to the minorities. The Jesuits found themselves carefully choosing which

contests they would join in, and which were to be considered misguided brawls unsuited for the participation of a Catholic parish. This attitude grew as a defense against the many radical movements which were born on Manhattan's lower east side.

The civil rights movement can be said to have been born in 1954, with the Supreme Court's decision on school desegregation, as Father General mentions in his recent letter, *The Interracial Apostolate* (12). By the time the Fordham-Nativity project was begun in 1965, civil rights had been studied, planned, discussed and acted upon for a decade. Its proponents had evolved a philosophy and strategy unique to the movement. Opportunities in the dominant society, they decided, were too limited for members of the Negro minority. Needed were radical structural changes in the shape of society itself. Don't blame the poverty of America's Negro citizens on some imagined Sambo-like characteristics of Negro people, but rather, busy yourself by reading the racial breakdown of participants in apprenticeship programs of key labor unions, or the relative reading scores of youngsters in inner-city and suburban schools, or by studying the patterns of white panic occurring when educated young Negro couples place a down payment on their first home away from metropolitan congestion. Civil rights strategists decided that America's minorities were in desperate need of partisan advocates who would lead minority interest groups in conflicts to change the power and policy of the main institutions of America's social structure.

Aligned with this strategy there developed a philosophy expressing the dignity of the poor: don't make moral judgements about the worthiness of welfare clients, and don't assume that different mating and family patterns classify poor communities as morally inferior. Such moral judgments, civil rights leaders believed, must be kept separated from the issues of granting poor minorities their legal and just rights. For example, if a Puerto Rican youth conforms to the norms of his father and grandfather by marrying out of wedlock at age fifteen, it is not the place of New York City's Family Court to relegate the boy to a psychiatric case worker who will spend months of probation trying to change the boy's cultural values. The cultures of minorities, it was felt, must be respected at least to the extent of not allowing

cultural differences to influence decisions about the allocation of the country's opportunities for human development.

Assimilation or restructuring

Such ideas were shaped and sculptured into action programs throughout the country when New York's Jesuits initiated the Fordham-Nativity project in a parish which for years had considered its apostolate to be one of aiding immigrants in cultural assimilation.

The new project brought with it a knowledge of the civil rights movement as well as a knowledge of the problems of theology and Church structure raised by Vatican II, especially as they applied to parish work. At the outset, the project team refused to enunciate a definite program, but wished to put its knowledge at the disposal of the regular parish staff, and work out a program in cooperation with them, drawing upon their long experience in the neighborhood and their knowledge of its history and its people.

Trouble hounded the parish staff and the project team at every step. The first crisis proved to be, where would the team live? The second crisis, what are the lines of authority? Then, when will the Mass for the *Catholic Worker* and artist group be moved to the main church building and modified to suit all parishioners? Who is in charge of the Mission Center? Every decision turned into a traumatic experience for all concerned. Communications could not be maintained, and the atmosphere never allowed for a rational exposition of the issues at stake.

Deeper than personalities, the difficulty stemmed from differences in basic orientation and philosophy concerning the apostolate. Some believed in presenting the parish as a respectable, permanent establishment helping people to make the grade morally, culturally and economically. Others were oriented toward structural change in New York's social institutions and religious change in the forms of parish life; they presupposed that the neighborhood people already possessed a spiritual vigor which yearned for an expressive liturgy; they viewed the parish congregation pluralistically and did not expect every Mass to be liturgically the same; they saw problems in the structure of the public school system to which they were willing to address themselves; they spoke of nuclei of Christian groups dispersed throughout the parish, of theological meetings in

the apartment houses, of involving laymen in the work of evangelizing their neighbors and serving the social needs of the People of God; they spoke of decentralizing the buildings of the parish plant and of de-emphasizing monetary considerations when planning strategy for the new form of parish.

The project failed and was disbanded, although officially it was said to be temporarily suspended. The church eventually abandoned plans for decentralized smaller buildings in the parish, and embarked on a money-raising campaign whose goal is to tear down and rebuild the church edifice on its original site. New men came into the parish, and the Jesuits who were first involved in the tumultuous planning, discussing and experimenting scattered. I doubt that the Province has a complete written record of this episode, or that anyone is making the effort to study that experiment or the causes for its failure.

One thread of continuity did remain, however. Before the Fordham-Nativity project began, the priests and laymen of the Mission Center were preparing a proposal for an educational and community involvement anti-poverty project. This proposal was funded early in the Fall of 1965, after the Fordham-Nativity project's priests worked hard to see it through its final stages of bureaucratic red tape. That anti-poverty project was born, grew and is still in full vigor thanks to the patience and talent of the Jesuit director of the Mission Center and to the dedication of the laymen who run the anti-poverty project.

At the close of the Fordham-Nativity project, therefore, three structures remained at Nativity: the parish church, the Mission Center, and the anti-poverty project. Each had different goals and a different job to do. Parish work proved to be distinct from anti-poverty work, and the Mission Center's work was somewhat different from both of the others. Despite a turnover of personnel, peace never came to Nativity. The new men continued the old debates, and it was not until 1967 that plans for decentralizing the parish buildings were finally abandoned.

What interpretation can we give to these two years of Nativity's life? When Fr. Janer was at Nativity, his own dynamism and courage must have allowed him to absorb personally much of the impact of the crises occurring periodically in the Jesuit community

whenever the goals of Nativity as seen by the priests of the parish church conflicted with the goals at the Mission Center. Furthermore, Fr. Janer's talents allowed him to combine somehow social action and parish work into a single entity with neither element suffering neglect. When he was reassigned, the men who replaced him were told by the provincial that the age of courageous pioneers was passing into the time when ordinary Jesuits could engage in follow-up work, operating from the structures erected by the pioneers, so that men of Fr. Janer's caliber could move on to other tasks.

Two years later, the Mission Center and the church had moved no closer to agreement, the conflicts were no less frequent, and if anything had changed it was a lessening of the social action carried on by the Center and an intensification of the Center's "parish" characteristics. The separate goals of social action and parish work could not be successfully combined by Nativity's new staff. Inevitably, the priority of goals fell in favor of the parent structure—the church—which outweighed the Center in authority and financial resources.

The reality of what was happening was obscured by the anti-poverty project's success. The laymen operated this project in a separate building with independent funds and separate lines of authority, but retained the name of Nativity. The independence of this project meant that its funds and authority were well aligned with its own project-goals. This in no way denigrates the parish, for my point is that the goals of the parish, backed by its funds and the orientation of its authorities, lay in a different direction entirely from the anti-poverty project, and their mutual independence was a blessing to them both. The success of the anti-poverty project, however, tended to hide from view the ills of the Mission Center.

The Mission Center had limited financial resources of its own and limited authority over its own activities. It was dependent upon the parish in many ways. The goals of the Center, however, had traditionally embodied a greater emphasis upon social action than had the goals of the parish church. Under such circumstances, friction was inevitable. The structures at Nativity were poorly planned and as a result the apostolate to which Father General calls attention in his letter suffered.

A word must be said now about structural change within the Province. No honest man can read Father General's recent letter without feeling empty and somewhat helpless. Where have we gone wrong? If we can just get our hands around the Jesuit problem, we might be able to bend things into proper shape. This must be our honest response when one man in full possession of the facts about our province apostolates—Father General—tells us,

> When past and present accomplishments in the interracial apostolate are duly acknowledged, it remains true that the Society of Jesus has not committed its manpower and other resources to that apostolate in any degree commensurate with the need (24).

And he reminds us that this judgment is applicable not only in reference to Negroes, but also to "the Puerto Ricans clustered largely in such cities as New York" (9).

A part-time apostolate

What has happened in the provinces to "cool off" those voices which called for social involvement? How have our "young Turks" been satisfied and yet side-tracked from institutionalizing their ideas? Four years ago the New York Province held top-level conferences discussing our social involvements, at which papers were read and projects specified by experienced priests as well as by theologians and philosophers who represented ideas expressed after community discussions at Woodstock and Shrub Oak. Yet today Father General is again asking for "provincial and community discussions, specific recommendations" (28). Why?

Let us talk plainly and without jargon. There is a theory which holds that any structured group of people, proud of its history and traditions, likes to protect itself against extreme social change. The group which cannot ostracize its radical sons will find ways of harmlessly absorbing their impact, satisfying them, and cooling off their innovative ardor. Often this is done very sincerely in the interests of "reducing the visions of our prophets to practical implementation."

For example, the strategies by which a dominant society "cools out" its conflict groups—satisfies them without changing the system—are varied and subtle. How many energetic young Negro leaders in America have been diverted from criticizing existing structures by being handed funds for a Head Start project, and thereby kept busy writing governmental reports and minding the

children who one year later are fed into the jaws of an unchanged, unchallenged public school system? How many potentially profound theologians have been diverted from articulating new religious values in the Church because they were set to the task of turning altars to face the people? These strategies are as unconscious as they are effective for maintaining the status quo.

This interpretation, of course, does not apply directly to a Jesuit province's attempts to adjust to the needs of the social apostolate. Few in the province particularly relish the burdens of authority, and there are no groups anxious to wrest power in a province. But the theory does serve to highlight certain aspects of the response of a Jesuit province to its needs for social involvement. The first noteworthy aspect is that social projects have frequently been pushed back to our houses of formation. Scholastics observe or participate in poverty projects in their spare time, after their study assignments are finished. This has been done to train our men in social awareness, and it is evidence of the spirit of our young men. But it also has the side-effect of satisfying these men, and keeping them from taking critical looks at the province structures which await them as priests and regents in the modern world.

Once they are out in the apostolate, what becomes of the social prophet[s]? How are their visions made "practical"? Some are assigned to parishes, some to schools, some to retreat work. In short, they are fed into existing structures. Occasionally, they are isolated from any province structure by being placed individually in a secular agency or a public school classroom. If assigned to a province structure, they may succeed to a greater or lesser degree in individually engaging in socially relevant activities in their spare time. The ambitious teacher can tutor "underprivileged" youngsters after class or hold extracurricular discussions of social problems; the zealous parish or retreat priest can make a purely personal commitment of his time and energy to social action, after his door-duty is fulfilled or his retreat talk delivered. Yet he cannot ask for parish money for a "secular" project such as hiring a layman to organize a rent strike or a welfare group. Such projects do not fall within the goals of parish work.

And it is true. The goals of parish work are not the goals of the social apostolate. Nor do the goals of our schools presently include

teaching normal youngsters of poverty groups or the potential juvenile delinquent. Retreat work does not directly mean community work, and never will. The needs of the poor involve more than committees, discussions, and articles. One cannot work in this field in his spare time. I am sure that many Jesuits have lost their ardor for social work because they were kept too busy teaching high school. But where are our structures specifically for community action, for social work, for juvenile delinquent work, for dealing with housing problems, dope addiction, welfare problems, poverty-level education, job training and self-help projects among the Catholic and non-Catholic urban poor?

Community work of this sort is a field in itself. It has a long history encompassing the Schools of Social Work and of Sociology in cities such as Chicago and New York, and extending through techniques of casework and group work to the newly emerging strategies of community involvement in self-help and interest group projects. The study of one narrow category, such as the effects of broken homes upon poverty youngsters, takes us through volumes and uncovers intervention techniques as varied as is individual psychiatric casework from group involvement in a national heritage course or in conflict group formation. If the Jesuits choose to enter this field they must take it on its own terms, and immerse themselves in the issues, past experiments and present directions of the field.

Above all, we cannot assume that we have something unique to offer in this field simply because we've read the Gospels. We must not think that putting a religious interpretation on concepts like community spirit or social solidarity will automatically constitute a significant contribution to solving problems like juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, poor housing, poor education, underemployment, or dope addiction. We should not attempt to create a theory of "Christian community organizing;" religion already has its place in community studies and the function of the parish in a neighborhood is already appreciated by social workers and sociologists. We need not justify our existence in this field by relating our activities to the Gospel. Rather, we should enter the secular arena on an equal level methodologically and theoretically with its present practicioners, rising to the challenge of matching them in their dedication and expertise among the urban poor.

We must begin thinking structurally about province involvement in the poverty apostolate. Poverty projects have their own objectives and must have their own authority, funds and personnel. We cannot fulfill our responsibilities in this field by operating small, ancillary projects within other apostolates, which tax the time and energy of the personnel without affecting the main goals of the parent apostolate. Poverty work is not parish work. Likewise, if we are serious about a commitment to the education of the poor, we cannot rest content with extracurricular tutoring help to the better-than-average members of poverty groups. We must commit a school and its staff totally to the education of students residing in a slum area, and engage in whatever supportive social services and community work prove necessary for the education of these youngsters.

Province assimilation or restructuring

Neither can we rest content with releasing individual Jesuits for assignments in secular agencies. It would be futile to place an individual Jesuit in a public school classroom and expect thereby to have any noticeable impact upon the education of minority groups. Educational systems are not affected by individual teachers, nor can a Jesuit expect to succeed where equally dedicated and intelligent lay teachers attuned to the needs of minority groups have failed. If Jesuits have anything to offer large American cities, it is the competition which our educational systems could offer the public schools, in developing techniques for teaching the lower class youngster.

Placing an individual Jesuit in a secular social agency or in an anti-poverty project also seems to fall short of the commitment of province resources of which we are capable at this time. Does it not smack of "cooling off" tactics to place the men anxious for social work outside the regular province structures, isolated from each other, in a multitude of disparate governmental or private agencies?

We must not—indeed if we consider ourselves spiritually sensitive men, we dare not—allow our planning to be stymied by the fear that economic insolvency would reward our efforts to meet the needs of the city's poverty groups. Is the province's talent at grantsmanship at such a low ebb that we cannot hope for govern-

mental, private or archdiocesan support for our projects? Or does the conventional wisdom dictate that we not advance from the central economic tradition which has guided the province until today? Funds from whatever sources should be accepted and used in behalf of today's urban poor.

Finally, if the Jesuits assigned to the poverty apostolate will need anything, they will need the support of meaningful community life. This extends beyond community recreation after working hours; our men need more than a group with whom to watch television and drink beer. It includes the mutual support of men whose intellectual milieu and occupational pursuits are similar enough to create a spirit of common endeavor in the apostolate. While it is true that basically different people can meet each other in charity, this can only occur if they each come forth from their own supportive intellectual and spiritual communities and if they therefore are not dependent upon each other for approval or agreement. It is impossible to profit from a "community" of people who disagree on vital questions of apostolic commitment but who share a common interest in football.

These few ideas constitute one man's interpretation of Father General's letter on *The Interracial Apostolate*, an interpretation formed against the background of two years' experience in social work among Manhattan's urban poor. In response to their own needs, France once produced its *Action Populaire* and the Latin American countries, their *Centros Investigaciones y Acciones Sociales*. In the United States, other times and other needs called forth our labor schools and our Institute for Social Order on the local and national levels. Today, the problems of the urban poor are being felt by every part of the nation. Our response must be on an urban basis and must combine research with action.

III

The Role of Jesuit Education

Edward G. Winner
Director, Urban Teaching Intern Program,
District of Columbia

Let me begin by confessing that I went to school under the Jesuits, and returned to teach with them; in fact, I learned to teach the hard way—in a Jesuit high school. Several years ago I left my position on a Jesuit faculty to assume a similar position at an inner-city public high school a few blocks—and a few educational light-years—away.

I left to take that job because I was afraid that time was slipping by. My generation had been that indifferent one of the early Fifties, and as we arrived at the New Frontier I could not stand and watch while others in those exciting summers of the early Sixties went South for the first skirmishes of what is shaping up to be the war of our time. I moved into the inner-city and took on a new and difficult job because I felt that I was almost too late. If there was a sense of urgency at the opening of this decade, here is a sense almost of desperation as it begins to close.

Fr. Arrupe addresses himself specifically to the plight of the Negro in the cities of our country. One of many difficulties is that the Negro today is not that refugee from Harriet Beecher Stowe who still greatly influences much public discussion: the Negro as a simple but honest agrarian, with shining face and happy smile, looking for a hand to help him up, asking only for forty acres and a mule. We must be certain to understand that the Negro today is the same man who has lived in our cities and has been the very muscle of our urban development for over a century. The children in our schools today do not go home to pick cotton; they go home to watch television, to read newspapers and magazines, to view, at least, the same middle class picture of American life that every other American sees.

What is new in our day is that the Negro has finally given up waiting for the white man to do the right thing. He has de-

termined by whatever way possible to do it for himself; to do it wholeheartedly, to do it completely. He needs help, but it can no longer be the gratuitous help of the Abolitionists.

What I hope is called for in Fr. Arrupe's letter is a determination and an ability on the part of all of us to play a secondary role, under a leadership not always the most experienced or the most skilled. Such a determination requires a sense of Christianity not as easy as that old missionary spirit.

Much of the crisis he recognizes is a crisis of young people, and this is a crisis in education. In my position I cannot help but see this crisis as one rooted in teaching itself, not in school plants, or textbooks, or bus schedules. And it is teaching which is the art at which Jesuits excel. I have therefore read Fr. Arrupe's letter for its implications for inner-city teaching. He suggests a lack of involvement; he feels that change is occurring and progress is being made without the full participation of the Society. But even more, I fear we are at a crossroads of change, and without such involvement we will not go forward, but will go down the tempting road of "law and order," with repressive change—stop and search laws, investigative arrests, anti-riot measures—and the great promise of education will be shelved again. Police already earn more than teachers, and our city fathers are buying tanks instead of textbooks.

The word "Jesuit" in the lexicon of this country is almost synonymous with education. It is on these grounds, then, that the Jesuits have the greatest contribution to make. Fr. Arrupe is likewise correct in his assertion that personal participation is not enough. For a hundred years we have seen personal concern and participation dissipated by organized indifference. If the Society is to follow the directions of its Father General, I believe that it must be directly in the field of education, and that it must bring to the effort its full organizational weight. Let us assume that the Society is about to make a full-scale, organized effort to participate in and influence the general education of the Negro in the urban centers of the United States. A pretty tall order, and not a moment too soon. From a very minor vantage point, I would like to make a few observations concerning immediate tasks to be undertaken.

The problem exists in the cities proper, not on their fringes. It

exists on street corners, in housing projects, often on the very doorsteps of some major Jesuit institutions. Many of these institutions are ideally located, so ideally that their current contact with the community they serve is carried on only through massive commuter efforts. One need only stand in the parking lot of a Jesuit school in most of our cities and watch the caravan of cars arrive from far-off suburbia, filled with students already tired from a long and arduous journey. This, then, is the "where" of our concern.

The problem is so great that a dissipation of effort is very easy. At the public school where I taught we surveyed the neighborhood and found that forty-eight distinct agencies were doing social work within walking distance of the school.

Any effort the Jesuits make must be first of all concentrated, and secondly must be related—perhaps at some cost to dignity—to the efforts of many other agencies. The most active agencies for change today are not very "nice." They are militant and often irritating; they are not very respectful. But as the kids say, "That's where the action is."

The Jesuits, in a catalytic role in the Church, must find ways of public participation. The old shibboleths of Church and State are real when parochial education is carried on for properly dues-paying Catholic children. What if the situation were to be reversed? What if the enormous resources of the Church were to go in the other direction, rather than State resources being sought for the Church? What if the object of our efforts were the "public" child rather than the parochial one?

The effort must involve all of the resources available to the Society: universities, high schools, houses of study, and parish residences must join together in a single effort.

Each of us must recognize the need for "re-tooling." Special training, such as that we give our young interns before sending them into the ghetto schools, is essential. I, and any other well-intentioned white liberal, must confess the exceptional difficulties of re-thinking and re-evaluating myself: my motives, my prejudices, my instinctive reactions. Too often those self-protective devices of each man's self place the blame for his personal problems on the environment, the home situation, society, the establish-

ment, the system. Such work will require something poorly titled "sensitivity training"; the Society's philosophers and psychologists have a major role to play.

And concerted effort to work with inner-city children does not by any means include the abandonment of the middle-class child. A truly effective program would educate everyone. Most particularly, it would bring the two disparate elements in our society into a single educational program. The middle-class parent places great trust in the Jesuits, and this very trust can be a tool by which the white parent and child—most in need of education—engage in a truly valid experience.

A complex of functions

Within any particular complex of Jesuit institutions I would envision such a program as a complex of many factors: teacher training, special education centers and facilities, particular work with youngsters of many ages and with many needs, and community school activities. To give a very specific example, in Washington we began, in 1964, a "College Orientation Program" for inner-city public high school students with low achievement but high potential. This program was centered at Georgetown University. Shortly thereafter we began a Higher Achievement Program, this time working with junior high school students, and centered at Gonzaga High School. Currently we are discussing the establishment of a Master of Arts in Teaching program at Georgetown. Each of these programs has direct lines into the public schools both in policy and finance. All of them are logically linked together and could easily conform to a single-minded and centrally directed Jesuit effort in the city as a whole.

At the heart of any major effort must be a carefully developed proposal for assisting in the training of the teachers and other professionals and paraprofessionals working in urban education. Needed are not merely bodies, but well prepared persons with particular skills specifically trained for the jobs they are to do. With the help of local school systems and recent federal legislation, Jesuit institutions are already equipped to train teachers, administrators, aides, and community workers. Such a role as a training agency greatly multiplies the effectiveness of any effort.

Many Jesuit institutions are in the heart of urban areas where

major efforts are now being made to involve the local residents directly in the operations of community agencies, and especially the public schools. The Bundy report in New York and the Passow report in Washington are but two indices of the potential for the immediate future. Most of these grass roots community organizations are becoming aware of the need for professional advice and help—but from outside the Establishment. In Washington, for example, George Washington University, Maryland University, and Howard University are working directly with parent groups in designing new educational programs. Antioch College is assisting a neighborhood in operating a model school. The search is on for new ideas and new relationships.

I hope that these items will be taken as casual observations rather than as specifics, for I see in Fr. Arrupe's letter an understanding of a need not for such specific ideas so much as for the full-time devotion of the faith, capacity, and intelligence of the Society of Jesus to the problems of urban life today. I sincerely hope the Society can find the vital and significant role which the letter has eloquently described.

IV

Intergroup Relations and The Jesuit Apostolate

Philip S. Hurley, S.J.
Jesuit Office for Intergroup Relations, New York Province

The fourth paragraph of the letter of Father General introduces a subject that must engage the attention of any Jesuit program involving intergroup agencies. It is the fact of conflict. It would be naïve to expect that our part in this apostolate will aim at eliminating all conflict. At the same time we must acknowledge that tensions can have a creative function if only we can somehow utilize them in the direction of constructive purposes. Dr. Dan Dodson, in an address delivered nine years ago to the 11th Annual Convention of the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, pointed out that "the challenge to us is not to find a

utopia in which there is to be no more conflict. This would be stultifying and would be the last place most of us would want to live. Our problem is rather that of finding ways to use conflict toward creative ends in our social relationships."

The New York University sociologist is far from advocating a positive striving to bring about conflict! Rather he accepts the realism of the situation: as the Gospel warns us of scandal, "it must needs come." So too must conflict come, for the simple reason that all of us are born into groups and conflict is one of the normal ways through which peoples react to one another. Dr. Dodson says further, "It is next to impossible to restructure relations between groups without some hostility and conflict and prejudicial behavior of peoples toward each other on a group basis."

In the case of the Society in America, our response to the call of Father General for "thought and action in attacking the twin evils of racial injustice and poverty in the United States" (5) must be launched with full awareness of the truth that there are few ways in which group relations can be restructured except through conflict. Failure to appreciate this phenomenon of social life is what has led many people to misunderstand and condemn the work of leaders in our day who, like Fr. James Groppi of Milwaukee, have had the courage to align themselves with groups in the eye of the hurricane of race relations.

This is equally true when our efforts lie outside the field of the activist; we have to anticipate the condemnation of those who feel that the only attempt we should make is simply to reduce conflict. Because some intergroup agencies have been afraid of such condemnation, they have rendered themselves ineffective. As Dr. Dodson points out, "the major portion of our [intergroup] agencies are afraid of conflict. All too many of the agencies we represent were created by mayors and other responsible officials whose interest was in keeping conflict from occurring in their communities." This should be borne in mind when Jesuits are invited to serve on various committees in their civic communities.

To achieve a balanced program between creative and destructive conflict is of course the great art of the intergroup worker. When men like Fr. Groppi or Saul Alinsky step into a tense situation, they know the fur will fly. Must they therefore refrain from exercising their style of leadership? When Fr. John LaFarge in

June, 1942, addressed the Madison Square Garden rally called by A. Philip Randolph to lead a March on Washington for the purpose of demanding a Fair Employment Law of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he was the only white man on the platform. This was true of many other occasions when Fr. LaFarge saw that it was necessary for a white clergyman to speak out. He paid the price of his apostolic courage, but he did so with conscious realization that the ensuing storm of criticism and hostility, even from his own religious brethren, was a necessary step toward the constructive effect of forcing issues to the surface. In no other way will there ever take place a showing of hands. Until everyone manifests complete understanding of what he signs up for in social conflict, we cannot tell the "do-gooders" and dilettantes from genuine apostles of social justice. "Too often," observes Dodson, "we are expected to placate conflicting interests rather than use such conflict to achieve creative goals in which relations between groups become restructured without destructive conflict."

Restructuring human relations

Father General shows his own awareness of this aspect of intergroup work when he declares toward the end of his letter, "the apostolate I have outlined may arouse adverse reactions in some quarters outside the Society. I am aware of the possibility of a lessening of financial assistance to the ministries in which we are now engaged" (33). We may even find ourselves the object of vilification and physical abuse as happened last October to the courageous Priests' Group in Newark who protested to their City Council the proposed use of police dogs to maintain order.

If we follow the reasoning of Dr. Dodson then, Jesuits should understand what is entailed in the restructuring of human relations. "Where the restructuring takes place such as happened in southern communities, it is understandable that there should be hostility and perhaps what the weather people would call 'turbulence' as the climate changes. It would be expected that those who have vested interests would give them up only reluctantly. It would be predictable that those who have been denied these privileges, who have been barred from them by legal procedure and by government power would get a new lease on life and aspire toward the breaking down of such barriers. It would be

taken for granted that this would bring hostility in its wake."

Two more quotations from Dr. Dodson may suffice to help us keep in focus this important feature of the Negro apostolate we are about to engage in. "There is a great danger that we may become placators or that we may become persons who use the status of our offices to keep change from happening, that is, to keep relations from being restructured rather than allowing conflict to run its course to the point at which restructuring takes place." Again, "It is not easy to interpret to the power structures of our communities this point of view. It is not easy to help them understand how these things operate. But the intergroup relations person who does a creative job must somehow help those with whom he works to understand the normal use of conflict in community relations."

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights with headquarters in Washington, headed up by Roy Wilkins and Arnold Aronson, whose weekly bulletins are so informative these days, lists over a hundred participating organizations on their letter-head. These groups represent a wide variety of interests in all parts of the country, religious, civic, educational, labor union and others. With most of them we should try to maintain close contact; with some we would be well advised to collaborate circumspectly. Not all would be prompt to endorse the position taken by Dodson. Still, most can help us as we plan our strategy in the days ahead. With a good many we have already cooperated in ecumenical matters. In any event, Jesuit efforts to carry out Father General's recommendation (27 *j*) of "Jesuit Policies" must coincide with the contribution so far made by these organizations.

Indeed this view of "creative conflict" affords a yardstick for separating the men from the boys among various intergroup agencies. With this in mind, we should definitely cooperate with them because they have assets that can provide valuable assistance to our own apostolate such as: (1) they can keep us informed with their alert posts for gathering news; (2) they are an important guide to governmental and legislative activity; (3) they readily put their know-how at our service; (4) they can occasionally supply a platform for us to set forth our ideas; (5) cooperation with them manifests an interest on our part, always an important con-

sideration in community relations; (6) the ecumenical value is likewise present.

Hence, Jesuit planning should include sophisticated cooperation with intergroup agencies around the country. We must not expect too much from them, nor feel that by accepting positions on their committees we have done all that is necessary to fulfill the directives laid down by Father General. These groups are a phenomenon of American life like Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis and Chambers of Commerce. We cannot overlook the tremendous achievements of the older and better tooled agencies in the civil rights field like NAACP and the Urban League. To its everlasting credit the Legal Defense Office of NAACP made its most memorable contribution to the cause with its series of costly and time-consuming law-suits instituted in the Forties and Fifties which culminated in the Supreme Court decision of 1954 outlawing segregation in the public schools.

At the same time many Negroes regard as tokenism the financial support of these agencies by huge white organizations, like the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. Large contributions are of course appreciated, but their giving can leave donors quite uncommitted, safely removed from the real issues, complacent in their private attitudes toward Negroes and often patronizing toward them. Since the riots of the summer of 1967, the retreat of many white liberals from their once militant position in favor of Negro rights has brought to Negroes a measure of disenchantment about the degree of commitment they can expect from certain intergroup agencies.

We cannot however limit our apostolate to participation in the endeavors of the agencies just described, valuable as they undoubtedly are. Unless our expression of concern is accompanied by deep personal involvement, we run the risk of appearing to the Negro as willing to work *for* him but not *with* him. Father General terms this involvement "a direct challenge to our sincerity in professing a Christian concept of man" (2). But our sincerity is only as convincing to the Negro as our willingness to "put our bodies on the line." Otherwise we might just as well stay in the classroom and give forth our theories to students we know are already convinced more by the attitudes of their social environment than they are by our philosophy.

If we want a hard-headed norm for evaluating our sincerity, we have it in the words of Father General when he defines the role of the Jesuit in the racial crisis: ". . . so to labor, in cooperation with men of good will as to make all phases of American institutions and practices an environment in which the human dignity and rights of all will be acknowledged, respected and protected" (4). I consider these words one of the clearest definitions of integration I have seen formulated. We can do no better in the crucial testing of our motives than analyze carefully their import to make sure that we are in full agreement with all that they imply before embarking on the practical steps of the apostolate.

For example: are we thoroughly convinced that we want Negroes to share with white Americans "all phases of American institutions and practices?" What of the social clubs, the golf clubs and residential areas that continue to bar Negro membership? What of "American practices" like dances and proms, holiday gatherings and the like to which Negro school-mates are seldom invited? We cannot proclaim ourselves as apostles of interracial justice and still hide behind evasive slogans like that of the "right of private association." Not only must we manifest clearly our own personal and religious abhorrence of such slogans, but we must make it abundantly clear to our students, parishioners and retreatants just how we feel and how we expect them to feel as Christians and Americans once they submit to our teaching and leadership. Open housing is one unmistakable issue that demands our support. Yet it will be the last to be whole-heartedly adopted by American whites. Home-owners make up one group that will show "massive reluctance" to share our goals.

What will be hardest of all for most of us (at least without being "conditioned intellectually and psychologically to meet with understanding and compassion the spiritual needs of the poor" [31]) will be the concrete manifestation to the Negro that we are willing to identify with him and his legitimate aspirations. Our identification must reach to the extent that we openly espouse and work toward the creation of that "environment in which (his) human dignity and rights will be acknowledged, respected and protected" (4). Unless we are so prepared, the Negro may interpret our policies as so many indications that we are willing to

work hard for him just so long as he does not move next door.

It takes long association before one is accepted deep down by the Negro. It requires humility to enter thoroughly into the thinking and attitudes of our Negro brethren. One sometimes hears the Negro compliment paid to a priest-apostle: "We do not think of Father as a white man; he is one of us." It has become a truism of Negro shrewdness to say that they can discern those of their race who tell the white man only what he wants to hear. They can be radar-keen in their appraisal of those people they label as "Uncle Toms." That same keenness of judgment enables them to form an uncanny estimate of their true friends.

Living conditions

One way by which we can give convincing evidence to the Negro of our sincerity in working on his behalf will be the degree to which we are prepared to share his living conditions. Father General did not omit to stress this. Only by close association with the Negro in his own environment can we really hope to establish rapport and prove ourselves in his eyes. What Father General has to say about our retreat houses is significant here. Our retreat houses do not discriminate in accepting retreatants. But the explanation of Negro absence from our retreats is to be found in the fact that we Jesuits are not close enough to Catholic Negroes to warrant the expectation that they will respond to our invitations. Most of our retreatants are men who came to know us and the value of retreats when they were our students or parishioners. There they learned the importance we attach to retreats. Right now we are seldom in such close contact with Negro men that we can discreetly bring up the subject of making a retreat. Only five percent of the Catholic population of the United States is Negro and few of that number can afford the usual expected offering for a week-end at our retreat houses. Until we have associated long and intimately with their life and their spiritual needs, we cannot hope for much of a response to our appeal in this line. Furthermore, while our houses may not discriminate, what notable effort is made by retreat-promoters to recruit Negro retreatants?

In this matter of identifying with the Negro we can learn much from teaching sisters in ghetto parochial schools. Here is one

group rarely noted and seldom called upon for their ideas on how to serve our Negro brethren. Yet the fact remains that the sisters in Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant and other inner-city areas are doing the most effective job in the Church today. They are revered by Negroes, especially Negro mothers, because they serve them through their children. They retain a lasting hold on the loyalty of Negro youth that few pastors can boast of. They know what it is to live in the slums; they know by daily presence the nerve-wracking noise, the filth and immorality of the worst neighborhoods. Where the clergy seem forever engaged in endless discussion and experimentation, the sisters go about their daily tasks cheerfully putting up with the wretched background of their pupils, the hopelessly inferior academic performance, the lack of motivation at home, the atmosphere impossible for study and a hundred other handicaps that their counterparts in the suburbs never have to contend with. Meanwhile, they carry on their day-to-day religious life in convents often as deteriorating as the buildings around them, doing their own cooking and washing, faithful to spiritual duties, amazingly cheerful and in love with their work. Last summer the windows of the convent of the Blessed Sacrament Sisters of St. Joseph's parish in Harlem were smashed and articles stolen. The Carmelites in Brooklyn can no longer have glass windows for their monastery. Contemplative life does not usually have to contend with the din and the human degradation of the "long, hot summer!"

I cite the example of the sisters as one indication of what it costs in personal comfort to win the trust and affection of Negro families. We cannot expect to do less and still achieve the degree of identification necessary for an effective apostolate. We ought at times to remind ourselves that these sisters come from families just like ours and from surroundings in which they once knew the comforts of middle-class living.

Finally, how will we ever reach the hard-core Negro youth called by Daniel Moynihan the "under-class?" These are the fellows from 18 to 30 caught in the hopeless "downward spiral" of unemployment: no skills, no education and no money. No group ever encountered by our missionaries in foreign lands has offered quite the resistance to our ministrations as has this frustrated and en-

raged segment of Negro life. They form a tinderbox that the slightest provocation can explode into destructive riots. To them we are "whitey," the hated foe of their guerilla warfare, objects of suspicion even with our Roman collars. Priests who have toiled twenty and thirty years in the streets of Harlem and Newark can make little headway with this hostile group. Experienced workers of the New York City Youth Board rarely report anything but bitterness and resentment. The number is growing. Only grace and tempered zeal will reach them.

Charity at a distance

It has often been said that the race problem in this country is not a Negro problem, but a white problem. It will not be solved in ghettos only, but must be attacked in the segregated minds of white people wherever they are to be found. For this reason one would have wished for a more explicit call from Father General for total involvement by the entire personnel of our American provinces. His practical directives do in reality extend the scope of this apostolate to all our men, but it has to be spelled out. Thus, for example, to single out the most urgent and critical need for out attention: open occupancy. Because our own families and those of our students and alumni come for the most part from middle-class, segregated residential areas we are going to have to face the fact that they will resent our efforts to open up housing for minority groups in all sections of our cities. Not to make this our manifest commitment will be interpreted by the Negro as willingness to work for his betterment as long as he stays where he is.

As soon as we line up with the advocates of open housing we must expect to hear our own brothers and sisters say to us, "It's all right for you religious to advocate open housing, but you have not sunk all your savings into a new home in a desirable area. You do not have to face depreciation of property values as we will if Negroes come into our neighborhood. You do not have to cope with the risk our children will run in their encounters with rough and predatory kids. You live in nicely segregated campuses or fortress-like rectories away from the noise, filth and violence of the slums. And our neighborhood will become a slum just as soon as they move in."

In the face of such opposition to our goals, it is easy for the teaching Jesuit or the administrator to back away and leave to the men assigned to the inner-city the responsibility of answering. Father General hints at this impasse when he lists the reasons for our failures in the past: there is the "mistaken notion that since other priests and religious are serving the Negro, we may exempt ourselves from the obligation of contributing a major effort to the struggle for interracial justice and charity" (22). If, on the other hand, the Negro apostolate has the status of our foreign missions, enjoying total support of an entire province, no one of us can consider himself removed from the responsibility of this apostolate. Unless this is made province policy, Jesuits will tend to absolve themselves (at least subjectively) from the total involvement without which the race issue will never be met to the degree our resources warrant. It will set apart the men in the social field from those not in it, because the latter will incline to side with their families and friends of the middle class, the people from segregated areas from which most have come and from which we now draw our student bodies and on whom we rely for financial support.

V

Return To Mobility

Robert E. McEwen, S.J.
Chairman, Economics Department, Boston College

An interesting question—how will the recent letter of Father General on *The Interracial Apostolate* affect the future of the Society in the United States? A quick, and I think accurate, answer is that it will galvanize action in several directions by American Jesuits. I suspect that, left to their own devices, some of these actions would have been taken in due time and for these the letter from Father General will just shorten the time period required to get these new programs into operation. For some other courses of action I believe the letter will serve as a suggestion for something that might not otherwise have been attempted, for ex-

ample, putting Jesuit professors on the faculties of Negro colleges.

I believe, therefore, the greatest contribution of the letter will be an awakening of all of us to the special nature of the crisis pertaining to race relations—a special urgency that calls for relatively extraordinary measures of response. I believe that many of us, with all the intellectual assent possible, have been under the impression that we were contributing in apostolates. I believe we will now act with a greater sense of urgency.

If there has been one failing in the modern society as I have viewed it, it has been the relatively slow reaction time it exhibits in the face of changed conditions and demands. I have been astonished that it takes years to implement a policy or program after the rank and file have practically unanimously agreed on its necessity. This I think is changing and if Father General's letter alerts us to the necessity for a quicker response by the Society, I think it will have served a tremendously useful purpose.

Once upon a time our adaptability and flexibility was supposed to have been our chief virtue and asset. With the passage of time and the solidification of organizational structures, this adaptability and capacity for quick reaction has diminished. There appear to be too many channels through which proposals have to go and too much caution and hesitation exhibited by those with the responsibility of decision making. I believe the new directions within the Church and within the Society are making it quite clear that such a leisurely process of adaptation to new requirements and demands is no longer in the best interests of the Church.

Let me take some animadversions by way of a slight digression. I am a little unhappy that there are some who think that this letter will suffer the same fate as the letter from Father General Janssens on *The Social Apostolate*. It is true that, if the previous instruction had been implemented immediately, many of the things said in the present letter on the race question would have been unnecessary.

However, in retrospect, in this case I do think that it is unfortunate that the identity of the drafting team for this letter has become widely known. This in one sense is contributing to its being written off as the work of individuals with special axes to grind. I think a good lesson can be had here on a necessity for strict

anonymity among the individuals who assist in the preparation and drafting of official documents.

Two questions

Two serious questions, on which considerable difference of opinion was manifested at our recent Round Hill Conference on ministries and social apostolates, are: (1) the institutional commitment of the Society in education; and (2) a question of direct personal action on the part of the individual Jesuit with Negro individuals and groups. These two are perhaps more related than they appear because it is the institutional commitment of members of the order that prevents in some cases more direct personal involvement in the Negro apostolate.

However, I do want to spend a few moments on the second question—our direct personal involvement. I believe this letter has steered a sensible middle course on this question by advocating three points: (a) the training of all of Ours, particularly our young, in the principles of social justice and charity; (b) personal involvement in some degree for everybody at some stage of his career; and (c) the developing of a few real experts in the area of race relations.

I have sensed a danger that some will exaggerate the importance or desirability of direct contact and action with the exploited poor to the detriment of more abstract educational and theoretical work. I find this a danger since I am convinced that efforts to propose and achieve laws, for instance, preventing a whole general class of fraud or misrepresentation affecting particularly the whole class of poor people, can contribute much more effectively to the alleviation of poverty and its attendant distress conditions than many days and years of effort and direct personal contact with the few out of the millions of poor people.

In this connection, therefore, for instance, I think that our efforts to get laws regulating door-to-door salesmen in the way they manipulate and trick poor people into signing outrageous contracts is an example in point. This, however, could only be achieved at the sacrifice of direct personal involvement with the individual poor. True it had to involve some knowledge of their condition, and it had to involve some contact with the leaders and spokesmen for Negro and underprivileged groups. But it could

only be achieved by a different type of action than what I see some of our young men asking for in their demand for direct personal contact.

Let me touch on another point that is a source of vague disturbance to me, at least. I said at the Round Hill Conference that I thought the letter on the race question unfortunately came ten years too late. By this I meant at the proper time to have alerted ours to prepare themselves and their institutions to play a leading and effective part in the fight for decent race relations was ten years ago. In one sense the battle has almost moved beyond us and without us. What I attempted to suggest was that the preferable course of action would have been a letter from Father General alerting the Society to matters in which it would be critically involved ten years from now and on which it should spend the next ten years preparing itself.

It's in this sense that I think the course of events has somewhat bypassed most of the Society. We are now jumping on a bandwagon that is pretty well past us.

VI

A Challenge to Sincerity

Richard T. McSorley, S.J.
Professor of Theology, Georgetown University

Father General Arrupe says that "the racial crisis involves . . . a direct challenge to our sincerity in professing a Christian concept of man" (2). There is no doubt about this in my mind. It is also, in a wider sense, a direct challenge to the sincerity of our living up to our faith.

As a pastor in a segregated area of Ridge, Maryland, from 1948 to 1952, I felt that I had the alternatives that a doctor would have when he is sent to an area beset by a plague that has been going on so long that the community at large would not admit that they were sick. The doctor in those circumstances could either go along with the community and give palliatives to those who had the plague, or he could tell them that they had the plague and endeavor to get them to look for a cure.

The priests and community in the area said if I did anything to try to bring whites and colored together, I would not be supported by a single white person in the area and that I would be run out of the territory.

My experience there convinced me that the refusal to oppose racial segregation openly poisons every other aspect of Christian life. It convinced me that the black and white issue of racial segregation, as opposed to the Christian ideal of personal dignity, is a very clear test of whether we respect that dignity in our own personal lives or whether it is being acted upon in the life of the Christian community around us.

Once it became clear to me that racial segregation was sinful, was harmful to the faith of the white community, was a basic violation of the Christian doctrine of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God, I found that everything else in the faith could be hung on this truth as on a "peg" and tested by it. I think that is what Father General is saying, that we can test the sincerity of our religious faith by the way it is practiced in a very clear issue like this that is all around us.

One way of showing how the Catholic Church in America failed in this test is to point out that there is not a single nationally-known Catholic leader who led in the civil rights struggle from 1963 to 1966. Dr. Martin Luther King, a Protestant minister, carried the Christian banner in this struggle.

My experience at Ridge, Maryland, indicates something of the size of the problem for the Society in the United States. Ridge, Maryland, was an area of Jesuit missions for about 325 years before I arrived there. After all that time of Jesuit leadership, despite some revolts against the system over the centuries, massive segregation was the pattern throughout the area. A long history like this cannot be quickly lived down. Its effects are deep-rooted.

Father General speaks of the convincing signs that the Negroes in America are giving, "of their determination to gain their rightful status as men and as full-fledged citizens" (3). Father General speaks at a time when the Vietnam war has weakened the hopes of the Negro community in America that the government will any longer support their struggle for human dignity.

Now we have the programs written into legislation, we have

other programs like Vice President Humphrey's recommendations on how to provide some remedy for the desperate condition of the Negroes in the urban ghettos, but we have a war which has taken away the will of the country, its energies and the money, so that none of the remedies suggested by good men like Vice President Humphrey are likely to be put into effect.

Long ago Alexander de Tocqueville, writing about America, said that the shortest way to short-circuit any beneficial social program is to have a war. That is what is happening to America now. The tide of hope for progress in civil rights for the Negro in America began to run out on the day we sent combat troops into Vietnam. That tide is flowing out now, not in.

Father General Arrupe comments on the words of Fr. Janssens, when he pleads with Jesuits to understand what it means to live in poverty all one's life. This I think illustrates quite clearly the relationship of the civil rights struggle in the United States to the Vietnam war. This is what I mean. The world today is divided into rich nations and poor nations. This gap is growing wider. The poor nations are about two-thirds of the population of the world. We now have that gap between the rich nations and the poor nations as a built-in part of our national system. The healing of this gap will not be done by military methods. Yet today the twenty-two million Negroes among us see our energy, our talent, and our money going to support the United States' war against a very poor country. They see our nation as having very little or no sympathy or time or energy for healing the domestic wounds.

Father General points to the grim forewarning of the danger lurking in America if we do not eradicate racial injustice and grinding poverty. This is true. What he does seem to realize is that there is no hope that the American people will have the heart or the money to give massive help to our urban poor as long as they are giving their energy and their interest to military measures that push them in the opposite direction, both psychologically and economically.

The acknowledged position of leadership of the United States in the free world makes it all the more serious. The United States' war in Vietnam effectively tells other nations, as well as the black

nation within our borders, that we will settle our problems with violence. Whether we expect it or not, our example will teach others, including Negroes in our midst, that they too can expect to solve their problems by violence; the war teaches them that this is the current American way.

Father General speaks of the ideals of America as enunciated in the *Declaration of Independence* (11). He notes how the *Declaration* refers "expressly to God, to the Creator, and . . . to His Divine Providence." This nation, with these ideals, allowed slavery. This prompted Thomas Jefferson, one of the framers, of the Declaration, to say, "When I reflect that God is just, I tremble for the future of this nation." The future of which Jefferson spoke is our present day.

Father General speaks of the famous Supreme Court decision of 1954 and the national legislation of 1964 and 1965 which outlawed many aspects of racial discrimination (12–13). What the letter fails to note is that the implementation of these laws, especially the comprehensive civil rights laws of 1964 and 1965, is being held to a minimum by the Congress of the United States. The funds available go to war. The same congressmen who opposed the civil rights legislation of 1964 and 1965 are those who most vigorously support the present war. They see the war as an effective way of nullifying that legislation. They have been very successful.

Father General speaks of the ideals of the *Declaration of Independence*, "of human freedom and equality under God," as contained in the theology of the Church (15). "The dignity of human personality, the unity of the human race, and the equality of all men are of the very essence of the Christian Gospel" (15). There is no doubt that the Christian creed and the American creed are identical in these points. But just as they are proclaimed by our government and by our Church, so they are followed in practice by neither. The Catholic Church in the United States has been a tail-light after the Supreme Court. The first statement by the bishops of the United States was in 1958. The Supreme Court spoke in 1954. Both the United States and the Catholic Church lived for three centuries with slavery, without doing very much about it. This long history has so weakened our country and our faith that it will not be easy for us to begin to take seriously

the truth that Father General is proposing, namely, that we, both as Americans and as Catholics, begin to practice what we preach about brotherhood. It seems clear to me that this truth is so basic that it effects everything else. Right now we cannot even begin to practice it seriously without affecting our attitude toward the Vietnam war. We cannot believe in brotherhood as applying to Negro Americans and not believe in it outside the national boundaries. It is not national brotherhood that we are talking about. It is the international brotherhood of man.

Father General quotes the American bishops' call of 1958 that "we act now and act decisively" (17). It is now 1968. The racist legislator today cloaks his racism under the patriotic disguise of supporting the war in Vietnam. There will be no funds for interracial justice at home because we need the funds for the Vietnam war. This makes their position more difficult to attack. It clearly illustrates the identity of the Vietnam war issue and racism.

Georgetown

Father General asks the question, "Has the historical reluctance of American citizens to implement the *Declaration of Independence* been sadly paralleled by a corresponding reluctance of our society to implement the fullness of Christian doctrine?" (18). I think the answer is yes on both counts. There is not a single Negro Jesuit in the Maryland province today. Up to five years ago, Georgetown University refused to give financial help to Negro basketball players. It was only after the pressure of students for a better basketball team that the Jesuits in charge of the athletic department decided to offer financial help to Negro students as well as to white students. This year is the first year that Georgetown University has a Negro basketball player. Last year, this same Negro was a non-playing member for technical reasons.

Georgetown, the oldest Catholic university in the country, had a Negro as president, Fr. Patrick Healy. But he wasn't recognized as a Negro by some of the people who thought he looked white. There is no other record of Negro Jesuits on the faculty of Georgetown in all that time. There is doubt that Fr. Healy would have been accepted had he looked clearly like a Negro.

But times have changed. Georgetown is now committed to follow the American and Christian ideal. One sample is the work

of Fr. Joseph Sweeney, who is chairman of the executive committee in the District of Columbia which is sponsoring OPEN, Opportunity Project for the Education of Negroes. The executive committee, made up of educational admissions officers of various universities in the area, has as its central purpose to encourage Negro students to finish high school. They enlist the help of high school counselors and clergy in finding middle-ability Negroes who need help. They look for students who cannot think of college and try to persuade them that this committee is a friend who will help them. They preach a doctrine that the society is better now and the chances are more open. They received fifty-four thousand dollars from the government under the education act of 1965 when they helped over a thousand students to enter college during the next year or two.

For the last four or five years, Georgetown University also ran the summer orientation program. The idea for this developed in 1963. The idea was to prepare those colored students who had only a marginal chance of getting into college to solidify their chances. In 1964 Georgetown University faculty and facilities were used for this project. The project trained students in subjects in which they were weak and which would help them to enter college. The project was financed by "Upward Bound," a section of the poverty program. In 1966 and up to the present, the project has been funded by the District of Columbia Public School System. The students are divided into two groups, those in the tenth grade and those in the eleventh grade. In 1967 there were seventy-six students in the program. To date, 175 disadvantaged students have benefited by the program, and more than fifty per cent are already in college.

Georgetown University also sponsored a program to train Spanish-speaking children of the inner city to speak English. This program last summer taught English to seventy children. It was sponsored by the United Planning Organization of the District of Columbia, a project which used poverty funds, and was under the general supervision of the Archdiocese of Washington. But the actual program was run by Georgetown University, who will be continuing it this summer.

As I see it, the letter from Father General will encourage all

those who work on these programs and on a far bigger program, the Community Action Program. The Community Action Program, organized by Fr. Jack Haughey, at about the beginning of 1963, reached the peak of involving about 700 students. These students were formed into about fifty different projects to serve the poor children in the slums of Washington, most of them Negro.

About fifty per cent of the projects were tutorial, that is, the students gave one or two hours per week of tutorial assistance either to individual students or to groups. The other projects were varied, supervision of sports, assistance in hospitality houses, staff help to neighborhood groups. All of these programs brought the Georgetown students in contact with the poor. This program continues quite strongly today, but without the numbers and enthusiasm it used to have. All the private agencies are hurt to some extent by the war atmosphere that is growing in the land. Likewise, much of the student interest is lessened by the involvment in the war effort and the uncertainty about the future for each individual.

The tribute that Father General pays to Frs. LaFarge and to John Markoe is well deserved. The point he makes about the very little corporate support for their efforts from the Society is quite true. I remember Fr. LaFarge saying that one of the most difficult tasks for those engaged in interracial justice for the Negro was not to get in trouble with Church authorities. I heard him say once, "After fifty years in the New York province, it may be that I will be able to skip purgatory and go directly to heaven." One of the probable effects of Father General's letter is that corporate opposition from the Society will no longer be one of the difficulties that individual Jesuits have to face when they work for justice for the Negro.

Under the heading of "Why So Little Involvement," Father General suggests as a possible answer "a failure to appreciate fully the practical implications of the Christian concept of man" (22). I think this is very true and I think it illustrates what I tried to say before, that a deep understanding of Christian brotherhood or the Christian concept of man can become a "peg" on which we hang other truths connected with the faith. This "peg" idea illustrates why it happens that most Jesuits and most others who are now involved in the peace movement in the United States

are the same people who, like Dr. King, are deeply involved in the civil rights struggle.

It is a fairly natural and simple step to understand that the Negro is your fellow man and he should not be treated with segregation. It is a more difficult and removed conclusion to go through the arguments that conclude with, "We should stop the bombing of our brothers in North Vietnam." This is a much more complex matter and one on which there will be less unity.

This is all the more true since a good deal of work by Jesuits is in institutions which, in one way or another, receive help from the United States government. By receiving this help, some of it necessary for their very existence, they find it much more difficult to disagree with the government on an issue like the war. This tends to commit us to accept the government's view of man instead of the Christian implication of man's dignity.

In my view the war issue in the United States today so overshadows the relations of colored and white that it is not likely that any Jesuits are going to be new converts to interest in civil rights while the war goes on. If they believe in the war they will put their energy in support of the war. If they do not believe in the war, they will spend their time and energy opposing it. They will have little time for interest left for the civil rights struggle. I think this is the way the entire country is being affected, not just Jesuits.

Practical difficulties

Father General suggests that we reduce our personal and community expenses and thereby assist the poor and identify ourselves with them (26). I think many would agree with this and do it if they could believe that the funds saved by such action would actually be devoted to the help of the poor. But most of us are part of an institutional system which makes it very uncertain that any restriction in our personal diet or way of living would be used for the benefit of the poor. The dramatic solution to this would be to follow the suggestion of Father General that Jesuits who wish to do this would be allowed to live in a poor neighborhood among the poor whom they served.

The thorough training suggested by Father General throughout the course will be ineffective today unless it deals with the war as well as with racial justice (27 *b*). The two become so intertwined

in our present-day society that one cannot be understood alone.

Negro vocations are not likely to develop for a long while, for the seeds for these vocations are just beginning to be sown (27 *c*). They are being sown in an atmosphere of war which makes their growth very uncertain.

Georgetown is now making the effort to encourage involvement of qualified Negroes. However, the economic barriers are still massive (27 *e*). During the years since 1950 that I have been interested in doing something for racial justice, I have always felt that our large parish of St. Aloysius in Washington and St. Ignatius in Baltimore have been unfriendly to Negro people (27 *f*). St. Aloysius, in particular, is in the heart of a Negro residence area. Yet my impression has been that it struggles to remain a white parish, drawing white people from outside the area instead of seeking the Negroes inside the area. I think Father General's letter will hasten the end of this kind of operation, which is already on the way out.

I am glad Father General cites the open-door policy to Negroes which should exist in the retreat houses (27 *g*). I tried in 1950 to get a Negro entrance into a retreat but failed. Now, as I look back on it, I wonder if the retreat itself was worth very much when this attitude was practiced. Even as I look back on the yearly Spiritual Exercises which were given to me all through the years in the Society, I don't recall once when the racial issue was ever mentioned. Yet it seems to me that if ever there was an application of the third degree of humility it would be in a person who preferred to be a Negro in the United States. It seems strange to me now that this was never mentioned in a retreat in all my years in the society.

What Father General says about contracts being signed with those business firms that observe fair employment practices will be very effective (27 *i*). I hope we do that.

The greatest hope for the effectiveness of Father General's letter is in the section of practical programs: (28–32): the establishment of provincial advisers who will recommend how the province can respond to the letter, Jesuit residences in the Negro sections of the city, the training of Jesuits for inner city apostolates—all of this is in the right direction and a reason for joy and hope.

The closing paragraphs of Father General's letter, in which he says, "I understand clearly the difficult challenge which faces us," bring me back to the issue of war and peace again (33). There is nothing in the letter which indicates that he does understand that racial justice in the United States is now deeply intwined with the war in Vietnam. As I see it, the Church and the Jesuit order in the United States is so dependent on government help, so desirous of government favor, that it is not likely to move in a direction that in any way separates itself from that government help. But I think that the signs of the time indicate that we will do nothing seriously effective in any broad way to win the support of the Negro people of the United States if they see us identified in all our institutions with the war efforts of the government. To make even a small break from identifying ourself with support of the government will require courage of a high supernatural order of which Father General speaks (33). It will require a reassessment of the relationship of our faith and our patriotism.

As I see it, we are going to be forced to decide not only on the matter of Vietnam but on the matter of working for peace in the world after Vietnam. We are going to be forced to decide whether or not we can support our government's war policy and our respect and love for our fellow men who live beyond the boundaries of America. It seems to me that if our decision lies in the direction of supporting our government's war policy, then we will not be able to respect our fellow man even when he is an American.

VII

936 Whitelock Street

Leo J. Gafney, S.J.
Co-director, Whitelock Street Center, Baltimore, Maryland

We three—Joe Healy, Joe Kakalec, and myself—moved into Baltimore in September. We live there five days a week and are finishing our theology at Woodstock on the other two: Monday and Tuesday. Our work has been varied, unpredictable, interesting. We taught for eight weeks, three mornings a week in adult

education programs. We have been called upon to help in many day to day crises. We have tried to live as good neighbors and good Christians—making our home and ourselves available to serve in whatever way seems best at the time.

We have been supported in part by a diocesan fund—which pays our rent, telephone, and gas and electric. This comes to about $200 a month. And in part by our earnings from teaching, and from generous gifts of friends. Our expenses for food, car (we have had nine flats), and other things has run another $200 to $250 a month.

There is much talk about the systematic changes which must be effected—in education, job training, housing, welfare, etc., if our poverty and racial problems are to be resolved. There can be no doubt that revolutions in these areas are needed. There is, however, another problem which is more subtle, elusive, and all-pervading than any of the above. It is the problem of people who do not really speak or really listen to each other. What follows are the excerpts from my journal which pertain to one family and which illustrate the problems of people who are bound together by family ties and yet are in many ways sadly isolated from one another. The Christian, and especially the priest must, I think, somehow try to get into the middle of things and, by being friendly to all, help to reconcile people to one another.

Wednesday, Nov. 1

Visited the Dunn family across the street for the third time yesterday. Seems to be a rather sad situation. The mother is quite high strung and worn out. Has been in the hospital several times—I believe with minor breakdowns. She has had nine children. Four are married and don't live at home; one girl, 17, has a baby and lives at home; then there is another teenage girl, a teenage boy, and a younger boy and girl. The main problem now seems to be with the teenagers: Sara, a girl 15, and Tom Jr., 14. Sara stays out all hours and doesn't help around the house. Tom Jr. is moody, steals, and set fire to his father's car last week. These two spent some two years in foster homes when their mother was sick. The father lives at home and is a hard working guy. So far I have talked to the mother on two occasions for awhile and to the father once. They both said pretty much the same thing—simply

can't do anything with Sara and Tom Jr. Met Sara taking her little nephew "trick or treating" yesterday evening and spoke to her for a few minutes. She was friendly anyway. I suggested that she not fuss with her mother so much and asked if she might like to drop around and help teach the younger children how to read. She goes to Douglass High School.

Friday, Nov. 3

Tom Jr. came around again yesterday afternoon. Gave him a novel about prizefighting and one of the Bible Society's New Testaments. Picked up 12 more yesterday.

Sunday, Nov. 5

Tom Dunn is over tonight and doing some dancing. A couple of friends with him.

Saturday, Nov. 18

Took Tom Jr. to his parent-teachers meeting the other night but we were at the wrong school. It was good to go for the ride anyway. Yesterday I stopped over at Douglass to ask about Sara Dunn. They couldn't locate her name and the vice-principal assured me that there was no such girl in the place. I went back to her house, got her report card, a note from her mother giving me permission to see her records, then went back. The v-p laughed and said, "I guess you're right." Seems like a rather ignorant guy. Couldn't see anything anyway because the counselor had it all and she had gone home.

Went back to the Dunn's house. Have met several other sisters lately—Mary, 17, not-married, has a little boy she had last summer. She seems pleasant, smiles a lot. The other day she said something about wishing she had listened to her father. This was spoken to and for the sake of Sara and Sara didn't forget it. Jennie has a couple of kids, is living with a guy—I think she is married.

So I was back at Dunn's. Mrs. D., Tom Jr., and Mary were there. (Am ahead of myself. A day or two before I went in and Mr. Dunn started yelling that it was all her fault—Mrs., for drinking so much. Said he couldn't bring them up all alone. Sara and Mary were there and sort of agreed. Mrs. defended herself saying she needed a little understanding and love. This put things in a new light because before that they had blamed the kids.) Mrs. D. said Tom Jr. had been doing better but Sara hadn't gone to school in

two days because her good coat was in the cleaners. Looked at her report card and it was poor.

There was a noise outside and Mary said, "the grouch is coming." Enter Mr. D. He didn't say hello to anyone. Asked what was for dinner and went into the front room. Mrs. D. said lima beans and salmon. Said she wanted to fix potatoes but couldn't find the knife. He said nothing. In a little while she brought his dinner in to him. Tom Jr. and Milly came in during the next few minutes. Conversation turned to Sara. Mary said the case worker had been around and said something about a home. Enter Sara. She saw her report card and wondered why it was being shown around. Complained about this. Hard to say how it happened but the next thing it seemed to me that everyone was putting her down. Now Sara never lets things ride. She has great spirit and an answer for everything. Frequently a damned good one. Mr. D. topped it all by demanding that she be in by ten o'clock every night. Sara has a sort of deep voice and slurry way of speaking and this gets worse when she is mad or excited. She was almost in the corner looking at the wall saying that she wouldn't "come home from no dance at no ten o'clock on no Friday night." Mr. D. came in from the front room yelling louder and she said he better tell the same thing to Tom Jr. She started for the door and on her way out with the grouch behind her I heard a loud crash—think he tried to hit her with something. I said goodbye, went out the door and called to Sara. The apartment is on the second floor. To my surprise she stopped and waited.

I suggested that we go over to the center and talk but she didn't want to go "to no center and do no talking." I kept pace with her down the street and she said she was going to Jennie's on Eutaw St. Asked her if I could come along. It was ok with her. She said if her father had hit her with that wire "he better not walk on no Whitelock St. no more." Asked about the coat and she said she had put it in with some of his clothes because otherwise he wouldn't pay for it. They won't split a ticket at the cleaners.

We got to Jennie's. Her husband left after a little while. (I latter found that this was not her husband although she is married.) Looked like he was going to work. Sara talked some more about how cheap her father was. Indicated that Mary was phony trying

to tell her (Sara) to shape up because she (Mary) drank. Sara said she was accused of drinking by her father but she didn't.

Said she stayed out late but didn't really do anything. After a party or something she would stand around the corner or walk by herself. Have seen her on the corner myself. Said she would come home if she could bring friends home sometimes. Said her mother was stupid enough to believe her father.

I am beginning to think that perhaps Sara is the sharpest, most honest and most spirited in the family. Wonder if she might be some sort of scapegoat because she tells it as it is? They are all going to Carolina for the Thanksgiving holidays but not her. Said she would like to go along on the trip to Woodstock we are planning. Said she would be around Sunday for Mass. I doubt it but am glad I was able to talk to her. Told her I would talk to her father. Said I would suggest that it be ten on weekdays, twelve on weekends, and that she be allowed to bring friends in.

Went back to talk to him but it's like talking to the radio. He said he wasn't going to reason with his kids. None of them were any good. He said she couldn't bring any of her wine drinking friends home. Said she could bring home a nice boy. I really couldn't get too far with the ten o'clock-twelve o'clock bit. I said I thought it was too bad that everyone jumped on Sara the minute she got in the door. Mrs. D. didn't say anything the whole while.

Friday, Nov. 24

Visited Sara Dunn's counselor over at Douglass Wednesday and had a short talk with her. Looked at some of Sara's records but didn't learn a whole lot. One thing I thought interesting was that she put down a great number of extracurricular activities and I doubt whether she really participated in them. But it seems like a good sign that she put them down. Appears that she at least wishes she were more in the midst of things. Visited the home later in the afternoon. They were all in good spirits getting ready for their trip to visit Mrs. D.'s people in North Carolina. Len, the seven year old, was baiting Sara a bit saying she and Mary were the "badest of all." Sara pinched Len in return. Met an older brother, George, 21. Seems very nice, hard working; also met his wife, Grace. Had some fried chicken and vegetables in the kitchen.

Sara was saying, more or less to her mother but I think to me too, that while she was staying with her sister over the weekend she'd probably come home early every night. There wasn't much response but Sara was in good humor. Noticed for the first time that little Benny, 10, or 11, is a bit left out of things.

Friday, Dec. 1

Had a big snow that lasted most of Thursday. Think it was about eight inches. Visited the Dunn's in the afternoon and found them in surprisingly good humor. Sara and her mother talked rather cheerily about little things. Sara also mentioned rather offhandedly that she guessed she had failed the tenth grade, didn't like Douglass and would rather quit school and work and go to night school. I suggested that it might be better to finish but then again maybe it wouldn't. Am not that sure.

Thursday, Dec. 7

Visited the Dunn's this afternoon and found some interesting developments. Milly had been living with Jennie over on Eutaw St. but Jennie didn't pay the rent for three weeks. It seems Milly had given her money and Jennie also gets welfare money. So Milly who has finished high school moved out—she has a good job—and got an apartment on Callow St. Also got her husband home for a few days on emergency leave. Mrs. D. was in a stew because Jennie left her two little ones there and went out; she also has Mary's to worry about. Sara came and went while I was there. Mrs. D. said the welfare worker was there. The latest plan was for Sara to live with Milly. Sounded pretty good to me but the welfare worker didn't like it.

Talked to Mrs. D. for awhile. She said Mr. D. was a drag. Mary also said he was a hermit. She said something else interesting —that Mr. D. wants everyone to depend on him, doesn't want them to be independent. Then Mrs. D. said she got married when she was 16—missed her teenage years. Said that when people miss their teenage life it piles back on them later on. That's why she wants to have some fun now.

Went over to Milly's place which is lovely. Her husband, Bill, was there and also Sara. We talked for a long time about what would be best for Sara. We agreed that she should try living there, catching up on her school work. Sara was surprisingly silent.

Never saw her without an answer before. When Milly talked Sara would look at her with a sort of wonder. Seemed as if she couldn't believe that so many people were concerned about her. She and Bill—who gets out of the army in five months—are going to see the welfare worker tomorrow.

Wednesday, Dec. 13

Went over to the welfare place with Bill and Sara last Friday and had a pretty fair talk with Mrs. Sue Jackson. I said I thought there were only four possibilities: Sara staying at home, moving in with Milly, going to a foster home, going to a girls' home. Of the four the second seemed best. Mrs. Jackson finally agreed and I was satisfied. Yesterday I found out through Frank Fallon, who knows another worker over there, that Sue Jackson was ranting and raving about Catholic priests; how they trade on the collar, think that welfare workers are not concerned about people but only with the bureaucracy, etc. This was a surprise to me. Hope to talk to her about it because I really thought we had an honest conversation. Haven't seen Sara or Milly again yet.

Friday, Dec. 15

Mrs. Sue Jackson, the Dunn's kids' worker, called yesterday and wanted to know how the new situation was working. I visited the Dunn's in the afternoon and Milly was there. Sara came in a bit later and I'd say she has never been in better spirits. The mother and father are both agreeable. Mr. D. even asked once in a quiet voice if Sara would do him a favor—go over to see one of the other sisters about taking her kids away—and she did.

Jennie has been a problem to them recently. She leaves her kids there for days on end it seems. Yesterday there were four kids under two—two of Jennie's, Mary's, and Milly's. Gets to be a lot for Mrs. D.

Thursday, Dec. 28

Christmas visit to the Dunn's was a sad affair. Have never seen Mrs. D. so upset. Said once before that she feels trapped and this time she really acted it out. Said Mrs. Jackson was blaming everything on her. Her husband was out having a good time. The girls dumped their babies on her to mind. Sara was as bad as ever and wanted to move back home. I really didn't know what to say at all. Have to feel sorry for her. She's about 41, has had an un-

happy life, raised nine children, has had several breakdowns, now when she should be getting some freedom she seems to be more caught than ever. I don't know what to try to do about Sara.

Saturday, Jan. 6

I had thought things were going well but stopped down at Milly's place and found that Sara hadn't been there since New Year's. This was just the day before I had seen her. Bill is home on leave. They said Sara had been staying home. Milly said everyone thought Sara was pregnant. Sara and Jennie stopped in here again this afternoon. Sara said she hadn't gone back because she thought they would throw her out if (or when, I forget exactly how she put it) she got pregnant. So far as I can figure she is—or at least thinks she is—I think she probably is.

Tuesday, Jan. 16

Saw the Dunn's off and on last week. Turns out Sara wasn't after all. I'm glad but I think she might be disappointed. Mary, of all people, showed some ambition and wanted me to take her over to the Concentrated Employment at old Poly on North St. I took Bob Buell over there last week and he signed up to take training in electricity. Looks pretty good. They pay forty dollars a week during the training period and then find a job for the person after. I took Mary over there. Along the way Mary told me that she had been to Planned Parenthood that morning and had gotten birth control pills. I told her I thought it was good not to have a baby she didn't want, but not good to have intercourse with every guy who came along. That this was just a way of wearing herself out and not a good way to prepare for marriage. She said I was right but she only had one boy friend. I left it at that.

She didn't have her Social Security card or the baby's birth certificate so had to go back. Was supposed to do that today. I went back to her house the other day to get the card. Mrs. D. was a bit upset because she was trying to take Sara to the clinic and they didn't know what to do with the baby. I offered to take him and they said ok. Felt funny carrying him all over the place but he is good anyway. Sara was supposed to go back to school yesterday but there was a big early morning snow so she had an excuse. Hope she went today.

Friday, Jan. 26

Wednesday morning I went to Carver High School to see about a transfer for Sara Dunn. Talked with the vice-principal and head counselor. Both were agreeable. The counselor, Clark, phoned Douglass for reading, math, and IQ scores.

Thursday, Jan. 30

Go up at nine Monday and drive in to get Sara and her mother and go over to Carver. When I got to the Dunn's Sara and her mother were screaming at each other. It was something about carfare and Sara told her mother to get her stinking breath out of her face. I talked to Sara for a minute in the hall and tried to tell her that quitting school wasn't the best way to prove anything to her parents.

Friday, Feb. 2

Stopped over to the Dunn's Wednesday morning and we had a long session. Jennie's husband got 120 years. He had been involved in a lot of robberies and a couple of murders. I laughed when I heard it. They said everyone did. Jennie wasn't there. Just Sara and her mother. And Mary in one of the back bedrooms. After awhile they got talking about race problems. Mrs. D. said he got so much time because he killed a white man. Said if one Negro kills another they don't do anything about it because it's just another one dead. As long as a Negro pleads self-defense he gets off easy—if it was another Negro involved. She told about once when she went to court after her husband had hit her and bruised her badly. She said white people were coming in and getting action on similar complaints. Then she got to joking a bit about growing up in the South and how she would have to carry laundry a long way to pick it up and deliver it when her mother washed it. The white kids had a rhyme, "Nigger, nigger black as tar, stuck his head in the molasses jar." She repeated it about three times and laughed each time.

The Dunn's are all very light skinned and, although they naturally resent prejudice, they are proud of their light skins. Mrs. D. told me her great grandmother was a white woman. She said her husband is an Indian. Mary called from the back room, "He a nigger."

Sara told some stories about kids calling her names when she went to an integrated school last year when she lived at the foster

home. Then as we were leaving—Mrs D. was taking some of the grandchildren back to Ruth and I was leaving—Sara got fussing with little Len. Len called her a nigger and Sara said, "What do you mean? You the blackest one in the house."

Looking back over my relationship with the various members of the Dunn family it's hard for me to say that I have made a difference in their lives. Tom Jr. is doing much better but that has nothing to do with me. Sara looks to be on her way out of school. Mary and Jennie are doing nothing. The parents are the same. And yet a lot has happened to me. And so perhaps this business of reconciliation is a two-way street. I hope it is clear how much I have come to like everyone involved in this little story. And how I have learned, perhaps, a little more about how to live with my neighbors—and with myself.

VIII

Memorandum: To Father Assistant, April 1945

John Courtney Murray, S.J.

I do not think that a case can be made out, on grounds of individual justice, for the admission of colored boys to our schools. But a case can be made out on other grounds: (A) those of social justice and social charity; and (B) those of supernatural charity.

A) *Social justice and social charity:* Social charity has for its object the creation, by the cooperation of all men, each according to his possibilities and responsibilities, of a social order that will serve the interests of the human person as a person, and in his relationships with other persons. Social justice aims at furthering the ends of charity, and at supporting the order of charity by effecting such an *institutional organization* of society as will assure to each human person the peaceful possession and full exercise of all his *rights*. Social justice is social, i.e., its act is that of participation in an organized program of action towards the creation of social institutions.

These obligations of social justice and charity are incumbent

on every one, according to his possibilities and responsibilities. Their obligation is heightened for the Christian by the fact that he is bound to their discharge by his share in the mission of the Church in the temporal order—a mission of justice and charity. Their obligation is trebly heightened for us by reason of our share in the pastoral mission of the Church.

In our present question, the concrete demands of social justice are that we participate effectively in a process and a program of elevating the Negro to his rightful status of equality in the community. Our manner and degree of participation will be determined by our possibilities and our responsibilities. This means, in general, two things:

1) Our initial and essential duty is that of enlightening the public conscience (and the ecclesiastical conscience, perhaps) with regard to the demands of justice and charity in the case of the Negro. The fact is that the Negro is the victim of a set of social institutions that deny him his rightful status (politically, economically, educationally, even "ecclesiastically") in the community. (By "social institution" I mean a certain organized method of acting in his regard, based on a set of ideas about him.)

We have the duty in social justice to do our part, in an organized, programmatic way, towards altering these institutions, and creating another set more conformable to the demands of justice and charity. This duty, I say, is initially discharged by educative efforts, from the pulpit, in our press, in our schools, conversations, etc.—in all the ways in which we have access to the public conscience.

2) Moreover, I believe our duty in social justice extends to more than just "talk." It also demands action. And I would affirm that one important action demanded is that of admitting Negro students to our schools. I do not make the affirmation on the grounds of the right of the individual Negro to a Catholic education (as I said, he has no such right as against the Society), but on our duty in social justice to cooperate towards the common good of society, which today demands such an institutional reorganization of society as will assure to the Negro his proper rights.

I am assuming that our presence in the educational field creates a definite responsibility toward the common good—that the total

finality of our schools is not adequately expressed by saying that they exist in order to "save souls." I am assuming, too, that public peace and the common good are menaced today in a serious way by the unsolved issue of the Negro—by critically dangerous racial tensions. I am assuming, thirdly, that our particular responsibility is for the production of leaders who will strongly further in society the cause of social justice and social charity, and who must, therefore, bring an important contribution to the solution of the racial problem.

I am assuming, finally, that these leaders must come from both the white and the colored groups, and that their training in leadership necessarily involves association with one another. Such association is necessary to generate that sympathy, understanding, mutual friendship and confidence, sharing of ideas, etc., without which effective cooperation is not possible. And such association must be set afoot during youth, when, under intelligent supervision, it can be most fruitful.

Against this background of ideas, I would assert that one of the functions of our schools today is to provide opportunities for this association between colored and white. By opening our schools to the Negro, we shall be setting up an *institution* for social justice; we shall be participating effectively in the process of bringing the Negro to his rightful status in the community. Moreover, this manner of participating in the process would seem to be obligatory, since it exactly corresponds to our own possibilities and responsibilities, and it is in virtue of them that our obligations are determined.

Our full duty to the common good of society, as well as to the good of the Negro, is not discharged by the fact that some of our Fathers do pastoral work among the Negroes. The fact is that we have at hand an institution (our school system), dedicated (in part) to the common good. In virtue of this general dedication, it cannot legitimately disinterest itself in one of today's major problems affecting the common good. It must formally become an institution effectively conspiring toward the solution of this problem. And it becomes such only when it is an arena of association between colored and white, and thus a training-ground for those who will, in the forum of the world, solve the problem of racial

tensions. Actually, their training is the essential S. J. contribution.

Since I am writing *currente calamo*, I am not sure that I am making my line of argument clear. (Certainly, I do not intend a full development.) The essential point is this. It is no good to appeal immediately to the doctrine of the Mystical Body, etc., and then immediately to conclude: "Negroes ought to be admitted to our schools." The conclusion does not follow. And I distrust these immediate flights into the supernatural.

The first step should be to determine the functions and responsibilities of our schools in the light of the current exigencies of the common good (and the good of the Church). These are the proximate and immediate grounds of decision as to the "obligation" of admitting Negro students. The decision once made, then we muster the whole power of the order of supernatural truth (Mystical Body, etc., etc.) in order to *motivate* our discharge of the obligation already established.

A note needs to be added. Obviously, social justice obliges us to do only what is possible at the moment, at the same time that we keep the ideal in view. If, therefore, admission of colored students is not immediately possible in this school or that, there is no obligation to admit them. But there remains an obligation to prepare the way for their admission by sustained and serious and intelligent educative work, on parents and boys. (Notice that, since social justice obliges us to further a process, it always imposes some obligation—that of taking the step in the process that is immediately possible.)

Furthermore, given the gravity of the situation and the weight of our responsibilities, the impossibility of admitting colored students should not lightly be taken for granted. There is room here for the exercise of courage, in the service of intelligence and tact. I might add that, if Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart can admit colored students, it is hard to see why we cannot. Unless it be that our rectors and deans lack what the administrators and staff of that college have. This may be the case. At all events, many difficulties could be cut through by high and persuasive leadership—of which, indeed, we have no great surplus.

B) *Supernatural charity:* This is the second ground that argues for the admission of Negroes to our schools, in two ways, positively and negatively.

1) *Positively* I am not thinking here of charity toward the individual Negro and the salvation of his individual soul. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to prove any obligation in charity toward individuals as such. I am thinking rather of charity toward the Negro group as a group, in their relation to the Church.

The fact is that the alienation of colored and white, and the unequal status of the Negro in comparison to the white constitutes an obstacle to the supernatural mission of the Church to the Negro group as a whole. As long as the Negro remains in his present cultural, social, and economic status, the work of the Church will make only very slow progress among the Negro population.

We have, therefore, an obligation in supernatural charity to remove this obstacle, again according to our possibilities and responsibilities; for these again, in conjunction with the seriousness of the objective situation, determine the measure of our obligation.

Moreover, I do not think we shall fully discharge this obligation even by the admission of a few Negroes here and there. What is indicated is a policy of admission. The reason is that only an educational policy is the proportionate instrument to combat the social policy that constitutes the obstacle to the Church's mission. We have to address ourselves to the group.

This, of course, does not mean promiscuous admission of colored students. We must still be selective—the principle of selection being the finality of the policy in the light of the particular character of our schools. Our aim is to form Negro and white leaders—those who can successfully associate with one another and profit by the association, and thus fit themselves for leadership. Furthermore, beginnings are necessarily small. And it is absolutely imperative that they be successful, on peril of jeopardizing the program.

Finally, I would emphasize that our duty in charity (to foster good relations between the Church and the Negro) will not be fully discharged if we merely aim at taking a few Negroes and making of them "good Catholics" in an individualistic sense. We must form instruments of the supernatural mission of the Church, precisely as it is directed to the Negro. (As well as instruments of the mission of the Church in the temporal order.) Obviously, this brings up the question of Negro vocations to the priesthood, as an

objective to be deliberately envisaged and pursued. It also brings up the question of Negro vocations to the Society, again as a formal objective.

I think these objectives must be deliberately envisaged, because the demands of charity are never minimal, but always high. At the same time, progress towards these objectives must be conceived as being under the supernatural providence of God. In other words, it is a question here of positing the conditions, and then of waiting to see what happens. What is outlawed, it seems to me, is full consent to the fixity of the present situation, in which the Negro is barred from entrance to our schools and seminaries, and to the Society in America. We certainly cannot say that this situation expresses the full will of God for the Negro.

2) *Negatively* What I mean here is this. The fact is that the Negro is freely admitted to secular (and some Protestant) schools. Hence the fact that he is barred from our schools constitutes a scandal. And we have a duty in charity to remove this scandal.

Admittedly, the scandal is pharisaical, if it supposes that we are violating any strict right of the Negro—we are not. It is, however, genuine in its judgment that we are not fulfilling our obligations in social justice and in charity, and are contributing, by our inertia, to the perpetuation of a situation that is unjust (I mean the general situation of the Negro, and not simply his exclusion from our schools; I think that our attitude to this latter, particular problem has to be controlled by our obligations with regard to the former, more general problem)....

I do not know whether this memo clarifies anything—nor whether its arguments would command the agreement of others. But here it is!

Summary statement

A) Social justice and social charity demand that our schools participate effectively, and in the manner dictated by their special possibilities and responsibilities, in the continuing social process of elevating the Negro to his rightful status in society.

This statement rests on two premises. First, an essential, if partial, purpose and function of our schools is to contribute *suo modo* to the common good of the civil community; for the proxi-

mate finality of all education lies within the temporal order of human life, personal and social. Secondly, the common good today is seriously menaced by the "Negro problem" (the institutionalized denial of justice and rightful equality to the colored group); for the common good is always menaced when the institutions of a society maintain any group in a status of unjust inferiority.

From these two facts, it follows that our schools must act effectively, and in the manner dictated by their own possibilities and responsibilities, toward the solution of the "Negro problem." Concretely, two courses of action are imperative:

1) Since our schools give us access to the public conscience in the critical years of its formation, they must undertake a program of systematic education of the public conscience (in our boys) with regard to the demands of justice and charity in the case of the Negro. This is the general responsibility of our schools, simply as educational institutions.

2) Since our schools have a responsibility for the production of leaders who will strongly further in society the processes of social justice and social charity, they must have a clearcut policy of admitting selected Negro students. For the "Negro problem" will be solved only under the associated leadership of white and colored; and therefore both white and colored must be formed to this leadership in association with one another during the period of their training to leadership. This is the special responsibility of our schools, as Jesuit educational institutions.

Note, however, that the obligations of any school at a given moment are limited by its possibilities. It will always and everywhere be possible to discharge the general obligation—education of the public conscience. But it will not always and everywhere be possible to discharge the special obligation—admission of colored students. Nevertheless, even in that event there will remain the obligation of preparing the way for their admission by sustained educative work on parents and students alike.

Furthermore, given the gravity of the situation and the weight of our responsibilities, the impossibility of admitting colored students should not be lightly taken for granted. There is room here for the exercise of courage in the service of intelligence, tact, and high social sense.

Finally, it must not be overlooked that the obligation of our schools to further the processes of social justice and charity, toward the common good, is heightened by their obligation to further the mission of the Church in the temporal order, which has the common good as its object.

B) Supernatural charity, and zeal for the supernatural mission of the Church also demand the admission of colored students to our schools. (The charity and zeal in question regard, not the individual Negro, but the Negro group as a group.)

This statement rests on two premises. First, an essential—and the ultimate—purpose of our schools is to further the supernatural mission of the Church. Secondly, this mission is hindered by the whole present social situation of the colored group—segregation, alienation from the white group, tension between them, cultural and economic inequality, etc.

Consequently, our schools are obligated to act toward correcting this situation, according to their possibilities and consequent responsibilities. In particular, they have an obligation in charity to terminate the grave scandal found in the fact that many secular schools admit Negroes, while many of our own bar them.

HE SAVED US FROM SCANDAL: JOHN MARKOE, S.J.

interracial apostle

Robert T. Reilly

Fr. John Markoe, S.J., died slowly, fighting for breath, as the Detroit riots, which agonized him, blazed hundreds of miles from his bedside. The news media referred to the deceased as "Omaha's most courageous cleric" and editorials lamented that his strong, compelling, instructive presence would no longer be felt.

When Fr. John Markoe decried racism as a "God Damned Thing," his punctuation returned this expletive to its original meaning. Slowed by two strokes, gaunt and bent, Fr. Markoe remained to the end a tough adversary of prejudice. Where once he had strolled daily through Omaha's Negro ghetto, he was reduced to taking a cab to make his infrequent rounds. Usually he just sat and his friends came to him. The poor, the lonely, the desperate, the prostitutes, the winos: he knew them all and they knew him.

Whitney Young, national director of the Urban League, called the retired Jesuit mathematician "a walking sermon." Roy Wilkins of the NAACP knew and admired him in St. Louis, and officials in CORE wrote to him for advice. John Howard Griffin, speaking at a testimonial dinner in Father Markoe's honor some years ago, referred to him as "one of the few who have acted, who have been what we all profess to be, who have salvaged us from unspeakable scandal."

Fr. Markoe was a somewhat anonymous civil rights leader, not

celebrated for anything he did in Selma or Harlem or Watts, but principally for his impact on Omaha's Near North Side. Everyone fights on the battlefield he's allotted, and for Father John Markoe, the arena became Omaha, a city of 350,000, ten per cent of whom are Negroes. A native of St. Paul, Minnesota, Fr. Markoe numbered among his ancestors a mayor of that city, a pioneer balloonist, an Anglican minister and a great great-grandfather whose Philadelphia militia escorted Gen. George Washington when he assumed command of the Continental Army. Enough blue blood ran in his veins to make him a social lion. Circumstances led him instead to the slums. His career began, however, not in the streets or the seminary, but behind the towered walls of the United States Military Academy.

There was something about him even in old age to suggest that he starred against Notre Dame in the first game of that great gridiron rivalry, and that he was named to the All-American team as end in his senior year. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Omar Bradley were teammates. General Carl Spaatz was his roommate and, in the baseball season, Markoe fielded the pitches of future coaching great, Bob Neyland. In 1914, the rugged, 6′2″ second lieutenant drew as his first assignment, a unit of Negro troops patrolling the Arizona-New Mexico border. Lieutenant Markoe instinctively fraternized with the soldiers, earning the disdain of his fellow officers. He also began to hit the bottle heavily. In the tedious campaign against the Yaqui Indians, the young lieutenant slipped into Mexican territory for some action, virtually demolished a bar, and tried to drag his commanding officer into the saloon for a drink. When he sobered up, he found himself cashiered out of the 10th Cavalry.

Back in Minnesota, Markoe tackled jobs in lumber and steel, but missed the military life. He was delighted when, as a member of the Minnesota National Guard, he was called up at the start of World War I. Texas was his destination this time; and despite his proclivity for drinking and fighting, Markoe made the rank of captain. Among his fellow officers in the area, were some of his classmates who still wore their lieutenant's bars.

There are tales of further riotous conduct, bar room brawls, arrest and jailbreak and, according to the story, it all came to an

end with the drunken Captain Markoe lying crosswise on a burro led by a Mexican peasant. Even without the pyrotechnics which accompanied St. Paul's conversion, Markoe somehow concluded that he had had enough. He swore off drinking and decided to join his older brother William, who had just been ordained a Jesuit.

A Jesuit for Negroes

The year was 1917 and, on the feast of the Assumption, the young seminarian, together with Fr. William Markoe and two other Jesuit priests, signed the following document:

> O, Jesus, we, the undersigned, resolve and determine, in honor of Thy Sacred Heart, Thy Holy Mother, our Guardian Angels and all our Patron Saints, especially Saint Ignatius and Saint Peter Claver, to give and dedicate our whole lives and all our energies, as far as we are able, and it is not contrary to a pure spirit of pure indifference and obedience, for the work of the salvation of the Negroes in the United States; and though altogether unworthy, we trust in the Sacred Hearts, O Jesus and Mary, to obtain for us the priceless favor of doing so. And do thou, O St. Peter Claver, pray for us. Amen. Also, daily to repeat this resolution, for the fulfillment of our expectations and desires.

His expectations and desires soon met up with the realities of bigotry, within and without his own Church. Shocked at the fact that St. Louis University denied admission to Negroes, the Markoe Brothers protested loudly and widely. Others joined them, and John carried the case as far as the Apostolic Delegate in Washington. Such conduct won few academic or episcopal friends. When the smoke cleared, Fr. William Markoe was sent to Denver; two compatriot Jesuits to Wisconsin and California; and Fr. John Markoe was dispatched to Creighton University in Omaha.

Omaha was not the Deep South, but it had, and has, its share of racism. Fr. Markoe's efforts were as resented, misunderstood and opposed as they had been in St. Louis. But daily he repeated the pledge and daily he fought for justice. John Howard Griffin, in a letter of tribute to both Markoe brothers, said:

> They were in this cauldron, deeply committed and fully aware that they would be hated by the very racists whom they were trying to salvage from the dehumanization of their racism. They saw clearly that racists, in the very name of Christianity, stab Christ in the darkness. They were in the cauldron before most of us were out of diapers. They took the bludgeonings that men of conscience must be prepared to take.

In St. Louis, Fr. John Markoe had the newspapers behind him in the fight which produced victory and transfer. In Omaha he formed his own organization, the De Porres Club, composed chiefly of Students and faculty members at Creighton University. Not all of his colleagues supported his views, of course, and there were priests in the archdiocese who felt embarrassed by his public demonstrations. Before protest tactics such as the boycott, sit-in and non-violent marches achieved popularity, Fr. Markoe was employing them in Omaha. His instructions to the De Porres Club members were always simple: "Is there discrimination in that place? Then go tell them about it." The club members staged restaurant sit-ins in the late 1940's and they carried equal employment placards twenty years ago. Fr. Markoe was usually with them, marching, suffering abuse, enduring shame. He clung like a bulldog to his unpopular stand.

There was never much of the intellectual about him. His concepts were disarmingly naive, straightforward and inevitably right. His selflessness made all compromise seem unworthy. In a newspaper interview, he scoffed at surveys about discrimination. "That's like surveying the Missouri River to see if it's wet," he said.

The increased activity of De Porres led to charges of communism, violent letters from alumni, inquiries from Church authorities and, finally, eviction of the club members from their campus quarters. They holed up in the back room of a Negro weekly newspaper, *The Omaha Star*, and continued their campaign. Nothing seemed to discourage Fr. Markoe, even the rebuffs he received from his own Church. "All my real opposition came from Catholic sources," he recalled, "and most of my help came from outside." But the constant pressure paid off, resulting in integration of public places, equal employment in industry and in the school system, and gains in other areas of civil rights. Ultimately, nearly all who opposed him came over to his side, some furtively, some with embarrassment, some openly admitting their dereliction. Omaha's Archbishop Gerald T. Bergan confessed publicly that Fr. John Markoe "has been 25 years ahead of all of us, including your Archbishop."

Although hampered by his illness, which had been pronounced terminal on numerous occasions, Fr. Markoe continued the battle

he began in 1917. The De Porres Club has ceased to exist, but its alumni function as committed individuals. Fr. Markoe's example always spoke even louder than his activity. His penetrating eyes, quality of command, his conviction and sanctity still impel others to press for full enactment of the principles he championed.

Love not guilt

Friends gave him money, knowing he always had a place for it. He also received limited annual royalties from the sale of his chart depicting the history of the Catholic Church. Just as he poured himself out, so he let these few dollars slip through his fingers into the hands of the poor. For a man with a reputation as a tough, inflexible combatant, he was as soft as innocence in the presence of the poor, the young and old. He was no do gooder, attracted by the romanticism of civil rights. He was not ever driven by feelings of guilt, as are other workers. Fr. Markoe truly, genuinely loved the Negroes he defended. He was at home with them, finding the same comfort in the ghetto that suburbanites enjoy on their patios.

Most mornings at Creighton University, you'd see young Negro children seated in the lobby. They were waiting for him. The elevator descended, Fr. Markoe emerged, and the children shyly walked to his embrace. He would introduce them to professors, take them to the student center for cokes, counsel them, give them money for their families. As he walked about the campus, his long arms on their shoulders, he created a striking figure. Everything about his tall frame, pain-streaked face, unruly white hair and deep eyes suggested portraits and photographs.

Fr. Markoe found pleasure in the progress of race relations in the last decade. And he found Pope John to be the perfect answer to the attitude of so many Christians. He was hopeful, but not subdued. John Howard Griffin recalls his spirit this way:

> Certain scenes in life are so pure, they never leave us. One such scene occurred in the final moment of my last visit with Father John Markoe. Shaking my hand, he said, "Never forget our motto."
> "What is that, Father?" I asked.
> "Don't give an inch," he said.
> That scene was a great gift from him to me. Constant dealings with racism sicken the soul. The odds against us are so overwhelming; our accomplishments seem so little, the tragedy so immense and implacable. In such times of

darkness, Father John's motto cuts through the confusion, the temptations to equivocate, like a surgeon's scalpel cutting away the rotten tissues.

"Rotten" was a favorite phrase of the Markoe brothers in describing the insult of racism. "Racism is evil," said John Markoe "because it's a heresy. It denies the teachings of Christ and the Church; it's against the natural law; it's against decency. And it makes people suffer. It brings humiliation, poverty, misery. There's no excuse for it. It's so evil, it's rotten."

Seventy-seven, and slowly dying, Fr. John Markoe was still upset at the tardiness of justice. He preached urgency and condemned all forms of gradualism. He remained deeply spiritual and grateful to God for the honorable mission He had given him. "Don't thank me for anything," he said, with unquestioned sincerity. "Thank God for whatever I have done." Even his personal life stayed simple. His small room was in perfect order, his few books packed—except for those he was reading—and his papers organized and filed. Everything was set for an instant transfer . . . or death. "When I go," he said, "I don't want them to have to spend five minutes disposing of my effects."

Today, a scholarship for Negro students bears his name; and he sometimes borrowed from this source to meet a friend's emergency. Other Jesuits have followed his example, working among the Negroes of this city. A group is conducting a summer live-in on the Near North Side, which Fr. "Cap" Markoe traversed for a quarter-century.

When he celebrated his Fiftieth Jubilee as a Jesuit, he had to be helped to his feet to join in the concelebrated Mass in his honor; and he distressed friends at a dinner that followed, worrying them that he might not be able to endure the long ceremony. When the time came for him to respond, however, he was on his feet. For a fleeting moment he looked like that young athlete of fifty years ago. Five decades of strife creased his face but there was fire in his eyes as he delivered his brief message. To his friends and disciples, he said, simply and directly: "Give 'em hell!" Perhaps he deserves a more pious epitaph, but understood in the context of the man who commanded it, it surely fits.

THE SANTA CLARA CONFERENCE: REFLECTION AND REMINISCENCE

one year later

Justin J. Kelly, S.J.

From August 6th through August 18, 1967, some seventy members of the American Assistancy met at Santa Clara University to discuss the total development of the Jesuit priest. The delegates included the eleven American provincials and half a hundred priests from all the Assistancy's regions and works. There were missionaries and university presidents, high-school teachers and social scientists, rectors, deans, theologians, and spiritual directors. Three philosophers, three regents, and five theologians represented the scholastics.

What the delegates accomplished during their two weeks of all-day discussions can best be seen by reading the published pages of the proceedings—in particular, the consensus positions and recommendations. Any final evaluation of the conference's achievements must obviously wait upon the putting into effect of these recommendations. The pre-note to the collection of consensus statements is careful to point out that they are not decrees, but simply a summary of the opinions of the majority of the conferees. The purpose of the Conference was not to legislate but to make recommendations to the provincials. It was to propose a number of practical means of implementing the program of renewal in the training of Jesuits initiated by the 31st General Congregation. In a few cases the recommendations actually run coun-

ter to previous legislation in the Society or in the Church (e.g., the length of tertianship, the amount of philosophy required for all, the theology program). In these instances the Conference delegates clearly felt that their own proposals more aptly embodied the intentions of the Council and of the recent Congregation than did the existing laws. Yet even supposing the concurrence of the provincials, some obstacles will plainly have to be surmounted before all of these suggestions can be tested in practice.

In this and other ways the outcome of the Conference depends upon the future success of its proposals—on the response of those in authority to them, as well as on their inherent practicality. Nevertheless, the moral influence of the opinions of such a cross-section of the Assistancy is bound to be considerable. This has already in fact been the case. I know from personal experience that the Conference's work has been enthusiastically welcomed by a number of young Jesuits. They find its recommendations more encouraging even than the decrees of the recent Congregation, insofar as Santa Clara's proposals for change are both more specific and more drastic. The author has often met a similar response among European Jesuits of every nationality, many of whom have read the consensus documents with great interest. The widely publicized letter of Fr. Arrupe regarding the "Third Way" came as a reaction to certain misinterpretations of the Conference's statement on relationships with women. This letter, about which more will be said below, is at least a sign that Father General sees the positions taken at Santa Clara as very influential. These are a few indications tending to confirm the conviction shared by most of the Santa Clara delegates, that the Conference marked a decisive option in the history of the Society in America.

This article will attempt to point out some of the new emphases in the training of Jesuits which emerge from a study of the consensus positions. It will also describe a few aspects of the meeting at Santa Clara itself—factors not immediately apparent to a reader of the proceedings, but significant for the understanding of what was done there. The presentation and background papers are too numerous and varied in content to be given an adequate commentary here. Similarly, the Survey of American Jesuits (which uncovered more useful information than its critics gave it credit

for) clearly requires some sort of professional interpretation and analysis, which unfortunately I am not competent to give. Most of my attention, therefore, will be devoted to the consensus documents and to the sessions themselves.

One way of summarizing the Conference's work would be to say that it endorsed three major principles with regard to the training of Jesuits. These principles are: flexibility or individual adaptation, professionalism, and the need for continuing education. A fourth emphasis, which is not so much a distinct principle as an aspect of the first three, is the need for greater continuity in Jesuit development. The meaning of these four factors will now be examined in detail.

Flexibility

Flexibility or Individual Adaptation: the Santa Clara documents repeatedly call for a more personalized and individualized course of training. The individual Jesuit is to be treated *as* an individual—in his spiritual development and in the ideals proposed to him, as well as in his program of studies, the length and type of regency he undergoes, etc. In fact, in the style of Jesuit formation envisaged by the Conference, there hardly is any such thing as "*the* course," in the old sense of the word. This fact appears most dramatically in Consensus Position IV, on academic and professional development, where it is stated that the integrating factor in a scholastic's education should be his field of specialization. It is no longer to be a set program, common to all, of classical literature and formal philosophy. Humanistic studies are seen as including and even centering around areas as diverse as art and physical science, sociology and theology. The amount of philosophy studied will vary according to individual needs and future work (Proceedings, III, 2, p. 13). The whole program is to be worked out by the individual in consultation with a full-time professional director of studies, who also has a hand in determining the nature and length of his regency and other apostolic experiments (*Ibid.*, 15–16).

Likewise, the theological program will allow and even encourage considerable variation and individual adaptation (C24, 26). As for the religious life, the statement on "Commitment" lays great stress on the individual's responsibility to discern God's will in relation to himself, as regards both taking his first vows and

continuing on to the priesthood (C4–5). In the novitiate, it is recommended that several associate directors assist the main novice director so that more personal attention may be given to the individual novice. Even the form of the novitiate—"whether a place or a spirit"—is left open (C10–11). The statement on psychological development urges that the ideals proposed should be fitted as much as possible to the capacity of the individual. Rather than forcing a man to become like someone else or to reach goals he obviously cannot attain, officials should help him "to project an ideal of *himself* at his best" (C31). Each man should be guided to the form and amount of prayer which is appropriate for him. Such authentic personal prayer cannot effectively be made the subject of legislation, but should be discerned by the individual under the guidance of his spiritual director. Liturgy, too, must enable the scholastic to personally experience the mystery of Christ in Christian community, rather than be simply a recitation of prayers or the performance of rubrical regulations (C60–61). The individual should be allowed to determine the time and place of his tertianship, so that the "concrete and *personal* contact with the things of the Society" which the 31st General Congregation sets as the value of the third probation, can be realized more effectively.

The principle of individual adaptation, of course, requires the individual to do some adapting too: flexibility bends both ways. The statements on the novitate and on psychological development insist that the individual adjust himself to the religious community he has entered and to its apostolic goals. The ultimate purpose of Jesuit formation is not self-fulfilment but service—or rather, it is only by self-sacrificing work for and with others that a Jesuit can really fulfil himself, "deepening his person by deepening his ability to love" (C30).

Professionalism

Professionalism: the second principle underlying the Santa Clara statements means more than simply fostering a serious and responsible attitude to one's work. Such an attitude has always been given at least verbal encouragement. But if in spite of all exhortations to responsibility, Jesuit apostolic labors often have a curiously slap-dash and amateurish look, this points to a basic weakness in the training. Has it been determined too much by formal

and traditional norms, and too little by the demands of the Jesuit's future work and of the world in which he must live? One recalls the much-quoted remark that the Jesuit course prepares a man perfectly for the post of Holy Roman Emperor. Another word for the "professionalism" proposed by the Santa Clara documents (in place of the inherited formalism of our training) might be "realism." It is an effort to permit the actual situation—the future apostolic work, the world of today—to have a more direct influence on the course of training: not only in studies, but in spiritual development and in everything else as well.

The novitiate formation, for example, is to be defined continually in terms of the works of the society, projected and present. Novice "experiments" must not be artificially contrived: they must both give the novice real experience and provide him with some "feed-back" on the results of his work, good and bad (C7). Similarly the apostolic work experiences, now envisaged as integral part of the educational program, are to take place in "real life" rather than manufactured situations. And they should continue long enough to enable a man to gain direct knowledge of his successes and failures (C17). As already mentioned, the integrating factor in the Jesuit's academic development is to be his field of special studies. Thus he should be able to fulfil the undergraduate requirements of his future graduate specialization during the time of his university studies. His future priestly work will be based on a strong theological formation running through the whole educational process, as well as on training in communication and interpersonal relations. These studies, even during the novitiate, are to be of genuine university caliber, and where possible they should be taken with lay college students. Thus the Jesuit will be involved from the first with the people with whom he is to deal in later life (C13).

The test of a relevant theological formation, according to Consensus Paper VI, is its capacity to deal with contemporary men and the contemporary intellectual world. Theological competence, including the ability to deal with problems of faith, is crucial for all Jesuits. Theology should be presented in terms of the pressing religious problems of today, particularly atheism and secular humanism (C22–24). This theme, which underlies many of the rec-

ommendations made regarding the theology program, was so strongly felt that a majority of delegates rejected an apparently innocuous statement which seemed to conflict with it. An earlier draft of the document urged "a strong concentration on the historical approach to theology." This was voted out by the delegates—not because they were opposed to historical theology, but because they wished the theological program to be clearly focussed on the present and the future rather than on the past.

Consensus Document VIII recommends formal training for positions of leadership and government in the Society and the apostolate. Leadership, in the form of ambition to serve, must be encouraged and developed. Updated and improved *informationes* are needed to bring about earlier and more accurate identification of those with the ability to lead and govern (C39–40).

The future ecumenical work of the Jesuit priest likewise requires professional preparation. The young Jesuit must be able to gain direct knowledge of non-Catholic Christian traditions through reading and personal contact. Dialogue with Protestant divinity students and cooperative social action should be a normal element in our education (C42–3). The same demand for adequate preparation appears in the statement on regency: no one should be assigned to teach subjects for which he is not professionally qualified; first year teachers should have lighter than normal teaching loads; competent direction and in-service training should be given to all teachers, etc. (C50–51). The need for adequately trained and effective spiritual directors is equally clear (C55).

The intention to substitute the actual demands of real situations for an excessive reliance on merely formal norms appears also in the statements on prayer and liturgy. Even personal prayer is seen, not as taking place in a vacuum, but as essentially communal and directed outward to the world of persons. God reveals himself to us in life-situations and in people, as well as in the scriptures, the sacraments, and the teaching Church. The young Jesuit should be led to discover God in the living Church. His prayer must be real and personal, not just the fulfilling of a formal obligation (C58-9, 61). Instruction in the liturgy, but even more a meaningful experience of the Eucharistic celebration, is an essential part of the Jesuit's apostolic preparation. The pressing apostolic impor-

tance of liturgical adaptation should lead superiors to take a positive attitude toward experimentation in the liturgy (C63–4).

Finally, the relative isolation of most Jesuits from the daily experience of truly poor people is regarded as a major cause of the ineffectiveness of exhortations in the matter of poverty. If the Jesuit is to be "seriously" poor, ways must be found of exposing him in his work and his community living to the experience of real poverty. This should be taken into account when Jesuit residences are being planned (C71–2).

Continuing education

Continuing education: this third principle is a corollary of the need for academic professionalism. As the preceding principle prohibits all forms of merely "playing at education," this one puts an end to the notion that a Jesuit's life of serious study can stop with the *ad grad.* No one is likely to have proposed a formal theory to this effect, but everyone is aware how easily it could and did happen in practice. In a sense it could hardly *not* happen, in view of the busy lives most priests lead, and also in view of the extreme formalism of the traditional course of studies. From the novitiate to the end of theology, the academic program was all too efficiently geared to covering the assigned matter and to passing examinations. Course-content was rarely affected by considerations of pastoral utility or contemporary relevance. Instead of developing a habit of wide reading on questions of personal interest, the course tended systematically, unintentionally, to discourage it. The treatment of philosophy and theology often gave the impression of providing final answers to all questions forever. Small wonder if the busy high school teacher or college administrator found his intellectual curiosity fully satisfied by *Time* magazine. After a seven-year diet of Latin manuals and notes-seeking-memorization, that academic appetite survived at all is the marvel.

It is with theological education and re-education that the Conference was particularly concerned. The statement on theological training observes that this process, by its very nature, "cannot be conceived of as terminating with the fulfillment of a specific curriculum" (C27). It asks the provincials to set up formal structures to provide opportunities for those who have finished the course to continue or renew their contact with theology. It sug-

gests intensive workshops in theology which could occasionally be substituted for the annual retreat (C28). The relative brevity with which the consensus documents deal with this matter is no index of its real importance. The lack of "theological confidence" is a major source of tension and disquiet among priests today, inside and outside the Society. Particularly within, the gap between those who feel at ease with the new theology, and those who, even if only a few years out of the course, do not, gives rise to noticeable strain. This was what one of the priest-delegates meant by remarking, when the problems of "the younger men" were being discussed, that "the problem of younger Jesuits today is older Jesuits." Theological insecurity accounts for much of the defensiveness, suspicion, and even outright hostility that scholastics and young priests sometimes encounter in their elders. The latter seem to feel that basic truths are being tossed aside and essential values trampled underfoot, that their own laboriously acquired knowledge is dismissed as out of date. A more thorough knowledge of the newly emerging theology would go far toward removing the causes of this disquiet. Really competent instruction in the significance of recent developments (e.g., in moral theology, in the liturgy, in the theology of the religious life) would bring out their essential continuity with what had gone before. It might help to restore a good many priests' confidence in themselves and in their fellow-Jesuits—and perhaps in the post-Conciliar Church as well. In addition to the theological institutes already mentioned, the statement on tertianship suggests a program of renewal that could be offered to older priests. It would last one or two months and would include both the Spiritual Exercises and lectures on new approaches in scripture, theology, and liturgy. The importance of such programs in the minds of the delegates reflects their conviction that "the total development of the Jesuit priest" is a lifelong endeavor.

Integration

Integration: the need for more continuity in the training of Jesuits is all too evident. In his presentation paper on "The Psychological, Personal, and Social Development of the Jesuit Priest" (Proceedings, Vol. II, Part 2), Fr. Carlo Weber perceptively describes the schizophrenic effect caused by the sudden transitions from one stage of the course to another. "The young man moves

from an anti-intellectual novitiate spirit into a hyper-intellectual juniorate and philosophate, and then back into an anti-intellectual regency. His faculties are simply *not allowed* to grow apace. We train, first the will, then the intellect, then the emotions, but not all of them together. *This defies all laws of psychic growth*" (207–8). In the intellectual sphere alone, the rigid Renaissance separation of subject matter into distinct blocks—two years of humanities, then three of philosophy, then four of theology—conflicts with modern educational theory, which calls for a more integrated and holistic approach to learning. Other considerations apart, the present faith-crisis and the ongoing changes in the Church make it imperative that the young Jesuit be trained in theology (scriptural, moral, and systematic) from the very beginning. The statement on theological education says that such programs—which have already begun in most places—should be coordinated with later divinity studies so as to avoid repetition and to shorten the entire course. Moreover, "the spiritual growth of the Jesuit should both contribute to his theological development and be nourished by it" (C23, 24).

The novitiate document likewise stresses the *continuity* of the novitiate with the rest of the person's life, both before entry and after vows. Attitudes and practices should not be radically different as he passes from one stage to another (C7). The same desire for a more integrated approach to personal development is reflected in the statements on prayer, on the liturgy, on poverty, on ecumenism, and on general education. This last is conceived as a university-level A.B. program, including theology and philosophy but centering around the individual's special area, and leading to a Master's Degree or its equivalent. The course, beginning in the novitiate, would normally last about five years, exclusive of the Master's program. In conjunction with the above-mentioned reduction of the theology or divinity-school course to a maximum of three years (C28), and also with the recommended abbreviation of regency to no more than two years (C50), and the possibility of taking tertianship in two three-month periods (C53), the entire course of Jesuit training for one entering out of high school would last ten or eleven years. (This includes the M.A. degree but not any further studies.) The proposed shorten-

ing of the course, particularly as regards philosophy and theology, is at variance with existing legislation in the Church and in the Society on the subject. The matter is so urgent and the need, it seems to me, so obvious, that one can only hope the legal obstacles will be quickly overcome. It is not just that the length of the training has harmful psychological side-effects, developing passivity and stifling initiative, as Fr. Weber remarks in his paper (207). Rather it is inefficient even from the educational point of view. In the Society as elsewhere, "work expands to fill the time allotted to it," and the awareness that one is wasting time to fill out a certain number of calendar years makes the learning process even less productive. In this perspective, a shorter education might mean a better education. The Conference's proposal to reduce the length of Jesuit training by 25% or more is far from the least important of its recommendations to the provincials.

There are many important aspects of the Santa Clara consensus positions which merit fuller comment. Within the scope of this article it has only been possible to refer in passing to such matters as, for example, the endorsement of controlled experimentation in the statement on liturgy, and the emphasis on a more immanent and spontaneous, less formal, approach to prayer. For some illuminating commentary on these documents, the reader is encouraged to consult the reports of Conference Sessions XVIII and XX (Proceedings, Vol. III, Part 2, pp. 34–51 and 61–85). I would also strongly recommend reading the discussions on obedience and authority (Sessions XXII and XXIII, pp. 96–137 of the same volume).

The third way

Since Fr. Arrupe's letter of December 12, 1967, has called so much attention to it, something must be said about the statement on "relationships with women" which concludes the document on psychological development. It goes without saying that the publicity this small section of the proceedings has received is out of all proportion to its actual importance in the Conference. Moreover, the General's condemnation of the "third way" and the Santa Clara recommendations meet only tangentially. Fr. Arrupe takes the way in which the latter has been "interpreted, or misinterpreted, by some of Ours" as a point of departure for his criti-

cism of certain practices which, he says, have sprung up in the assistancy. But the statement on Jesuits and women does not in fact approve of or even mention any of the activities condemned by Fr. Arrupe—dating, writing love letters, "fondling and kissing" women (as the *National Catholic Reporter* article which first publicized the Arrupe letter was careful to note). In fact the very phrase which Fr. Arrupe uses to define the "third way"—"an intimate, exclusive friendship with a woman"—refers to something already rejected by the Santa Clara statement. The fourth paragraph mentions "exclusiveness" in such a friendship as a danger to be avoided: "that kind of total emotional absorption which . . . impedes both parties in their psychological and spiritual growth" (C36).

Consequently, the widespread impression of a head-on collision between the views of Fr. Arrupe and those of the Conference on this subject is erroneous. Those of the delegates who discussed the matter with Fr. Small at the Conference will scarcely have been surprised at the content, at least, of Fr. General's letter. The difference in tone and emphasis between these two documents can be attributed chiefly to the different purposes for which each was written. The Conference wished to offer some clear, positive guidelines in a still uncharted and acutely problematic area. Fr. Arrupe was anxious to defend well-established religious principles underlying the vow of chastity from possible watering-down or misinterpretation.

In view of the presence of young Jesuits on the campuses of coeducational colleges, and still more of the end of the artificial isolation which once existed between religious in training and members of the opposite sex, the Conference judged that some definite statement on men-women relationships was urgent. It wanted to affirm the positive value, psychological and religious, in the friendship of a mature Jesuit for a woman. While recognizing the potential dangers in such a relationship, it preferred to regard them as an inescapable risk to be accepted in pursuit of a higher good. The self-abnegation, honesty, and integrity required to avoid these dangers were seen by the Conference as the condition of true friendship (C37). The occasion of Fr. Arrupe's statement, on the other hand, seems to have been the re-

quest of a provincial, whose name is not given, for a clarification of the Society's policy regarding "the practices called 'a third way'." Speaking from "religious premises," it declares that these practices are contrary to the vow of chastity and to the "affective renunciation and solitude of heart" which this implies. The letter is a quasi-legal document clearly directed against some specific abuses. It simply denies to those guilty of such behavior the right to appeal to the Santa Clara statement in defense of their actions. As such it can be seen as safeguarding the intention of the delegates in their statement on relationships with women rather than as contradicting it.

The Conference qualifies its affirmation of the good to be attained in such relationships with the clause, "provided they (the persons involved) have reached the stage of maturity which can sustain them" (C36). It may be that the Conference was overly optimistic about the maturity and intelligence of young Jesuits, scholastics and priests. If its confidence in them should prove excessive, however, it is at any rate no greater than that of Fr. Arrupe himself. Their honesty and sincerity are so well known, he writes, that he is sure his instruction to provincials advising them to dismiss "third way" practitioners from the Society will not cause the younger men to "become secretive in its practice." Overly sanguine or not, the Santa Clara statement on relationships with women is at least a courageous effort to define an ambiguous and highly important issue. Much more obviously has to be said before the implications of the vows and of "solitude of heart" can be clearly understood in their application to the new religious situation. It is to the credit of the Conference and of Fr. Arrupe that they faced this matter openly and initiated its discussion, in spite of attendant dangers and possible adverse publicity.

Liturgy at Santa Clara

This spirit of bringing problems out into the open typified the Santa Clara meeting as a whole. One of the most dramatic instances of this occurred toward the end of the first week, when Fr. Giles Milhaven mentioned the dual liturgies that were being celebrated at the Conference. "When we have Mass every day here at 12 o'clock, we have two groups. We have a group which celebrates in the church and a group which celebrates in the back

room." After confessing that "I am one of the boys in the back room," Fr. Milhaven went on to point out that this situation only mirrored what was happening in the Assistancy as a whole. Good men differed strongly on whether and how far one could experiment with or adapt the liturgy without explicit permission. (This fact had been amply illustrated already on the first afternoon of the Conference. A presentation paper written by Fr. Gordon Moreland had criticized those who were so obsessed by the need for a meaningful liturgy that they developed "a private liturgy, a quasi-Gnostic banquet" which expressed themselves but not the Christian community. A fellow-member of Fr. Moreland's task-force, Fr. Frank Molony, said that he could not subscribe to all the criticisms made in the paper because "I have the feeling that it's my own ox that's being gored.") Fr. Milhaven's revelations provoked the discussion which is reported in the Proceedings for Session XX (Vol. III, Part 2). This in turn led directly to the public concelebration on Sunday of an experimental Mass, using John L'Heureux's Canon, in which at least four provincials and forty of the other delegates took part. It also led eventually to the approval by the Conference of the statement on liturgy contained in the consensus documents. The back room had moved out front.

The above-mentioned incident raises the question of disagreement at the Conference. How much consensus is reflected in the consensus papers? A letter of the provincials after their fall meeting reminds the Assistancy that the Santa Clara documents merely express the opinions of the majority of the delegates. The pre-note to the collection of consensus positions and recommendations points out the same thing. It would be utterly false to suggest that the delegates were always (or indeed ever) unanimous in their views. And yet during the last three days of the meeting, when the consensus statements prepared by the committees were being scrutinized by the full assembly and voted on paragraph by paragraph, really close votes were rare. Of the dozen or so times when the final count showed a majority of ten or less, all but one or two—unless my memory fails me—concerned alternative wordings for an idea rather than real substantive issues. There was at times vigorous opposition from a minority—particularly

in relation to the Conference's statement on prayer, prepared by Fr. Cooke's committee. But with few exceptions it remained very much the opposition of a minority. (The eleven provincials, incidentally, did not take part in the voting, since the Conference was held in order to advise them. They did participate actively—sometimes heatedly—in the discussions, as the proceedings will amply testify.)

The spirit and direction of the Conference were determined largely by those who were directly involved in the training of Jesuit scholastics, and by the scholastics themselves. Regarding the latter, I think all the delegates will acknowledge that their influence on the meeting's outcome was considerable. They took a vigorous part in the discussions from the very first day—so much so that Fr. Henle, the Chairman, commented in a bulletin issued to the Assistancy during the Conference that the scholastic delegates showed no sign of thinking that the meeting had been taken over by "the Establishment." This was quite true, and yet as a scholastic representative I must confess that several of us feared precisely this before the Conference. As we entered the assembly-room for the first morning session, another scholastic delegate leaned over to me and whispered: "Do you suppose we're here like the Negroes in TV commercials?" At that moment I wasn't quite sure myself. But Fr. Henle's scrupulously even-handed chairmanship quickly dispelled any fears that the eleven of us were merely there "for show," and that we would not be listened to. Scholastics were on all or almost all of the committees which prepared the consensus statements, and made their voices heard in the general assembly too. Our two-day pre-Conference meeting at North Aurora in July probably gave us a slight advantage in preparedness over the other delegates, many of whom barely had time to read the presentation papers before the Conference opened. Whatever the cause, the scholastics "came on strong," and stayed on.

This is not to say that they constituted a power block. As C. J. McNaspy noted in his *America* article on Santa Clara, the divergences of opinion among them were as great as among any other group of delegates. In reality the Conference was fortunately lacking in power blocks, factions and Establishments. There was not

even the same liberal-conservative split which characterized the Council. Xavier Rynne, had he attended, would have been hard up for material. In Conciliar terms, all the delegates would have to be classified as "progressives."

And yet there remained among them significant differences of viewpoint. To the extent that these disagreements did not concern individual issues, merely, but tended to form a pattern, they reflected basically different evaluations of the present state of the Society and its young men in particular. One group tended to view this situation in terms of moral and spiritual sickness. The fact that young Jesuits were not behaving the way they used to, insisted on "meaningfulness," and were not going to Benediction, was regarded as symptomatic of a general religious decay. The present "permissive" atmosphere of the scholasticates should give way to a more disciplined manner of life. There should be a return to the fixed daily *ordo*, experimental Masses should be supressed, etc. Another group, by far the majority, preferred to see the situation of younger Jesuits today more positively, as part of a larger movement of change within the Church herself. This movement, in spite of the confusion and incidental aberrations it provoked, was fundamentally trustworthy, a groping toward fuller life. It was a problem calling for discernment and direction rather than suppression. This group felt, in fact, that an over-hasty exercise of authority in present circumstances would be futile and possible disastrous. Instead of trying to change the men, we should change the structures to give the men more room to grow. This latter point of view was overwhelmingly endorsed by the Conference.

The makeup of the Conference probably favored this result from the beginning. Though care was taken to secure as wide as possible a distribution of members, both geographical and in relation to works, the majority of delegates came from the scholasticates. This was both proper and inevitable in a meeting concerned with the course of training. Moreover, the men chosen were—and once again for good reason—by and large the more successful teachers, administrators, and spiritual directors. In other words they were precisely the people whom one could expect to have the greatest understanding of the men in training, the most

sympathy for them, and to be in turn liked and respected by them. The predominance of men such as these undoubtedly led to the result described.

The men responsible

It would be hard to name any single figure among the delegates as the dominant influence at the Conference. Any list of the more influential voices would certainly have to include Fr. Joe Wall of Alma, whose Hemingway-style beard bobbed vigorously in almost every session; Carlo Weber, who made in person comments as trenchant and acute as those which mark his presentation paper; Jack McCall, whose wit enlivened many a session; Fr. Henle, the indefatigable coordinator; Giles Milhaven, Nick Predovich, Dick Braun—but the list is almost endless. And a number who spoke seldom on the floor were effective in committees helping to determine the shape of the consensus documents. Fr. Bernard Cooke of Marquette would win my vote as the most impressive single figure among the delegates. Combining great clarity of mind with an almost charismatic faith, he helped to give other members the courage of their theological convictions. That is, he consistently put forth good theological reasons for doing what many other delegates felt instinctively was the right thing to do. Barney's influence was no small factor in creating the atmosphere of the Conference. That atmosphere, as many have testified, was one of tremendous relief and release. I had the feeling that not a few distinguished Jesuits were saying for the first time in public things they had always thought but never dared to utter. Some gave the impression of at last laying down a burden they had been carrying around for years. The resulting sense of freedom and mutual confidence was amazing. I heard a provincial say, and he was not alone in this reaction, that the two weeks at Santa Clara had been one of the greatest experiences of his life.

Possibly the best concise summary of the spirit of Santa Clara is an observation made by Fr. Cooke during his discussion of authority in the Church. "My generation, by and large, lived in a context of fear. . . . What I think has happened with the younger men is that they have decided they are not going to live like this. They are much more concerned about being deep Christians" (Proceedings, Vol. III, part 2, pp. 109–110). From the general

nodding of heads in response to Barney's remarks, I could see that he was expressing the opinions of a good many. My hope is that the Santa Clara Conference expresses an assistancy-wide decision, by no means confined to one age group, not to live in a context of fear, but to move creatively and confidently into the future.

From Woodstock Letters, Vol. 97 (1968), pp. 384-393.

IGNATIAN SURVEY: 1967

Edited by Robert C. Collins, S.J.

NEW APPROACHES

"Ignatian Exercises 1964–66" ("Ejercicios ignacianos 1964–66"), *by Ignacio Iparraguirre, S.J.*, Manresa 39 (1967) 147–68.

The modern change of perspective towards the *Spiritual Exercises* has opened new avenues for commentaries on the book. First, the Ignatian content has been rediscovered. Many problems of method are now taken as means and not as ends in themselves; and so they are given their proper value. Secondly, the existential aspect of the Exercises has come to the fore. No more abstract treatises on terms like creation, affection, etc., are being produced, which seemed to make mere philosophical investigations out of important passages of the Exercises. Most of all, the Exercises are now seen as the personal encounter of the retreatant with Christ. The discernment of spirits is being seen in proper perspective in the spiritual process of this encounter with Christ.

The causes of this change of perspective are: the post-Conciliar atmosphere, the deepening of understanding of the Ignatian methods, the directives given by Pope Paul VI, and the frequency and caliber of the national and international meetings on the Exercises. The principal characteristics of this new perspective follow.

1) Discovery of the vital scriptural background. The retreat master is not an exegete, but he must use Scripture in its proper sense in order not to present the affirmations of our faith in an overly pious manner without reference to the real meaning of the texts. (A helpful article in English is that of J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J., in *Woodstock Letters* 91 [1962]. Scriptural retreat plans have also been developed, e.g., by Joseph Enn, S.J.)

2) Liturgical emphasis. If the Spiritual Exercises fail to use the liturgy as part of their ecclesial aspect they will dry out for lack of inner strength. The liturgy is one of the great means for reflecting on and understanding God's plan of salvation. This deep meaning of the liturgy is the one that is now being sought for in the Spiritual Exercises. (See the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, No. 8; the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, No. 15; and the article by D. M. Stanley, S.J., in *Woodstock Letters* 93 [1964].)

3) Theological background. We now integrate the theological content with the meditation. Karl Rahner is the pioneer in this field. He himself says in the prologue to his *Spiritual Exercises* that he does not become involved in theological reflections that have nothing to do with the religious truths of the Exercises. He theologizes from the Exercises themselves.

4) A return to the sources. This is a complementary phase of what has been said already. These new approaches could appear to be destroying the Exercises; actually they have simply purified and enriched what was typically Ignatian. Nowadays it is becoming more clear how the Ignatian way is ecclesial. This trend is best exemplified by Hervé Coathalem's book, *Commentaire du livre des Exercices.* Antoin Dragon follows similar lines in his book. These two works exemplify the enormous amount of analysis and synthesis that is typical of the new approach to the text and method used by St. Ignatius.

5) Influences in the actual giving of the Exercises. These include: an ecumenical approach; retreats for non-Christians (as, for example, in India); the more active participation of the laity in the giving of retreats; and, in general, the adaptation of the retreats to the needs of modern man.

MARIO A. RODRIGUEZ, S.J.

COLLOQUIUM ON THE EXERCISES

"Colloquium on the Exercises of St. Ignatius" ("Colloque sur les Exercices de Saint Ignace"), *by Josef Sudbrack, S.J.*, **Christus** 14 (1967) 560–66.

AT PENTECOST, 1967 FIFTY JESUITS from the German Assistancy met at Bad Schönbrunn near Zurich to discuss the Exercises. Differences in approach appeared all along the line, with the boundary running through all countries, provinces, and age groups.

This first became apparent after a Dutch Jesuit made a presentation, using slides, of a style of retreat bearing entirely on the responsibility

of Christians in our time. The techniques—common life, discussion, work groups, etc.—as well as the content struck many of the Jesuits as very unusual. The point was that the demands of our present day have every right to a place in the Exercises, for the only Christ we will encounter is the Christ of today.

No one denied a place to contemporary relevance, but there were diverse views on how this should be accomplished. Can one start exclusively from man's responsibility to his age and move from there to an encounter with Christ? Do not the Exercises move in the opposite direction, from a decision for Christ to attention to the vital appeals of our own time? Further study of the Ignatian election should shed light on the question: Where are the concrete situation of the exercitant (which includes his relationship to his world as one of its essential elements) and his encounter with Christ inseparably joined together?

Contemporary man's faith is not something he possesses without questioning it. He is always deciding about it anew in every concrete choice. Should not the renewal and deepening of the decision to believe have the central place in the Exercises, with the particular objects of choice offered in the election serving simply as the material element of the judgment which sums up the more radical commitment to be a Christian? But isn't the typical Ignatian retreat concerned with the choice of a state in life? Or was not the experience of Ignatius at Manresa precisely a return to faith as to the center of Christianity?

Time was too short for full discussion of the problem of the use of Scripture in the Exercises. How faithfully should we follow the sequence of contemplations set down in the Exercises? Is it valid to substitute for the life of Christ some other principle of organization in the Exercises, such as the liturgy, or the sacraments, or some particular mystery of faith? There was general agreement, however, about the First Week of the Exercises. Could not the retreat begin with the glorified Christ, for example? There was agreement that the first week is a gathering together of the existential data facing man in his existential situation, from his imprisonment in the "everyday" to the very heart of his personal existence. All considered this an element essential to an Ignatian retreat.

Concerning the Exercises and psychology, the question posed was: What relationship is there between the process by which a man moves through the course of the Exercises and the process of a psychotherapeutic cure? There is a danger of unwittingly taking psychological phenomena to be religious events. Similarities are particularly abundant in the First Week: the discovery of self (or the religious decision)

takes as its point of departure an error in one's personal attitude rooted in the psyche (or in sin); recovery is crystallized around great archetypes (or truths of the history of salvation); the process leads to an opening of the man to a "thou." The one who gives the Exercises should not adopt the neutral attitude of the psychiatrist. He should abandon the role of master or teacher and enter dialogue in a spirit of mutual seeking for a deeper reality and level of faith.

There was surprising agreement in favor of colloquies or group meditations during a retreat. Since faith involves not only the individual but a "we," the actualization of faith which is at the heart of the Exercises calls for some involvement of a "we" in the retreat. Such colloquies are to be carefully distinguished from discussions and should not be allowed to degenerate into discussions. Two schemes were suggested: common meditation on Scripture (which takes the form of prayer), and dialogue about problems of faith (which takes the form of a common reflection or investigation). All agreed that such serious exchanges favor recollection, perhaps even more than solitude does.

R. C. C.

IGNATIUS' AUTOBIOGRAPHY

"A Reading of the Autobiography of St. Ignatius" ("Una lectura de la Autobiografía de San Ignacio"), *by Juan Villegas, S.J.*, Manresa 39 (1967) 27–40.

Ignatius' Spiritual Diary and Autobiography constitute the two most important documents of the Society's foundation and early life. They reveal the spiritual pilgrimage Ignatius had to follow so that God the Father would place him with Christ his Son, a sign of God's implicit approval of Ignatius' determination to serve his Lord and master. Both documents, the *Diary* and the *Autobiography*, form a dynamic unity: they represent Ignatius' life; while the *Spiritual Exercises* and the *Constitutions* of the Society are the practical formulation of Ignatius' decision to serve his fellow men within the hierarchical Church.

This article on the *Autobiography* reveals the unity which permeates Ignatius' account of his early spiritual odyssey, beginning with that afternoon at Loyola when the desires of imitating what St. Dominic or St. Francis came to him "with no further thought of circumstances than of promising to do with God's grace what they had done."

Ignatius' purpose in dictating his *Autobiography* to Luis Gonçalves da Câmara from August 4, 1553, to September 22, 1554, was no other than the spiritual edification of those who would follow the Society's

route. Just as the *Spiritual Exercises*—as Fr. Bremond has said—could be taken as Ignatius' autobiography rather than as a treatise on prayer, the *Autobiography* was meant to be a practical example of how to apply the discernment of spirits in a concrete situation.

The *Autobiography* shows three clearly distinct parts: (1) the role of discernment of spirits in relation to Ignatius' spiritual life, (2) Ignatius' gradual discovery of his ideal of service, and (3) the question of studies.

Ignatius took a radical decision to follow Christ in poverty and humiliation, although ". . . he never took a spiritual view of anything, nor even knew the meaning of humility, or charity, or patience, or discretion as a rule and measure of these virtues. His whole purpose was to perform these great, external works, for so had acted the saints for God's glory, without thought of any more particular circumstance" (*Autobiography*, No. 14). He will gradually realize the need to make his ideal something concrete and mature as he becomes aware of his status regarding the Church. The primitive ideal of journeying to Jerusalem, "undertaking all the disciplines and abstinences which a generous soul on fire with the love of God is wont to desire," will soon become something more realistic and explicit, in terms of obedience to the hierarchical Church.

First, Ignatius will change his decision of living in the Holy Land—his ideal of following Christ was no doubt in terms of personal devotion, of a chivalric self-denial "ad consolationem"—into an apostolic ideal of service to his fellow men, concretized later in his decision to pursue an academic degree in order to be able to help others without having to face a judge's accusation of Illuminism. In a sense, Ignatius the mystic yielded place to Ignatius the student.

Thus the *Autobiography* is not an analytic account of Ignatius' life, but a narration and a picture of life in the service of his concretized ideal—his fellow men. He has left us a finished image of the Ignatian style of life.

José L. Sáez, S.J.

THE WORD OF GOD

"Hearing the Word of God in the Exercises" ("Entendre la parole de Dieu dans les Exercices"), *by Henri Holstein, S.J.*, **Christus** 14 (1967) 80–96.

The Exercises are a privileged time for hearing the word of God in docility. To do this correctly, the rules for the discernment of spirits, especially those for the second week, are of special value. We are ac-

customed to apply them to the election; but they can also be applied to the contemplations as a help to avoid illusions and to draw the full benefit from them intended by Ignatius. We must not simply imitate the mystery, but must recognize and respond by an interior transformation to the questions put to us by the mystery.

One danger in treating the Gospel is to "archeologize"; that is, to use biblical criticism to explain the gospel accounts in a way which leaves them in a far-off world, long past, and with little message for us today. Another danger is "copying," by which the gospel scenes are reduced to various moral and ascetical attitudes, which are then put on by the retreatant as a sort of overcoat, without being really taken into his interior. A classic example is the contemplation on the hidden life at Nazareth, which is taken as a model of obedience, silence, and submission to long years of formation! Christ is considered exclusively as a model for imitation. Such a contemplation as the one on the hidden life will be truly profitable only if it leads the retreatant to understand the sources in him of the lack of humility, obedience, etc., of which the contemplation of Christ should make him aware. To get at these real problems, the rules for the discernment of spirits should be employed to help the retreatant see how and why he responds as he does to the personal, concrete invitation extended to him by Christ as encountered in this contemplation.

The selection of events to contemplate must itself be scrutinized to see that it is not guided by the retreatant's own secret prejudices, which incline him to listen to only *some* of the words directed to him by the Lord in the gospels. To listen to Christ properly, therefore, requires that we be revealed to ourselves. This is the work of Christ, as is illustrated in the gospels themselves: e.g., the rebuke to Peter at Caesarea Philippi and the words addressed to the father of the epileptic after the descent from Tabor.

The retreatant's reactions during prayer should be examined according to the rules for the discernment of spirits in order to interpret the significance of the difficulties, tedium, joy, etc., experienced in contemplating various events and words of Jesus. The director of the retreat is to aid in this discernment, which makes it possible for the retreatant to receive the Gospel as a word spoken to him. He must help the retreatant avoid both "archeologizing" and "copying" the Gospel. In order to do this, the director must himself avoid these errors and must, while proposing the Gospel to the retreatant, be open and attentive to the word of God. He should show himself to be a brother and companion to the retreatant, sharing a common desire to seek and accomplish God's will.

R. C. C.

AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM

"The Ever Greater Glory of God" ("L'honneur de Dieu toujours plus grand"), *by Karl Rahner, S.J.*, **Christus** 14 (1967) 218–37.

The motto "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam" is thought to express the essence of the Jesuits, their order, and their spirituality. Yet it remains a rather unclear formula and deserves some reconsideration. We will first consider where the difficulties lie in the formula; then we will make three preliminary observations; thirdly we will consider the place of the formula in the history of spirituality; finally we will treat the meaning of the motto itself.

1) The first difficulty that can be brought against the motto is that it does not characterize a particular religious order. It expresses an obligation common to all Christians. To do everything for the greater glory of God means simply to strive for holiness, and this is an obligation for all. According to the Gospel, every Christian is obliged to do "more" than has already been done in his own life and to keep himself open to a greater future. Ignatius' maxim therefore does not involve anything distinctive of him or of the order he founded.

A second difficulty is: Is it possible for man, a finite creature and a sinner, to exist for God's greater glory? We must be the recipients of God's revelation of his glory to us. If God himself has created a world which is finite and limited, falling short of "the best possible world," what does it mean to say that we sinners must do what will be for God's greater glory?

2) Nothing begins, even in the Church, which is not permeated by the atmosphere from which it comes. In fact it often requires a very close look to see that what has arisen is something radically new. We must carefully examine instances in which something new begins to see if what has begun is contingent in the way other temporal attitudes and events are, or whether it has a permanence that goes beyond them, so that it continues on in the living reality of the Church.

A second observation is that the distinctive character of a society is realized only in a very limited way in its individual members. We can even say that it is not necessary for a particular individual to embody in an especially intense way the distinctive spirit of his community.

Thirdly, we must remember that what is most lofty is often the most difficult to explicitate and remains necessarily only half understood. It is often changed into a mere slogan, which is on everyone's lips but without its own peculiar richness of meaning, and from being often repeated is most often not understood.

3) Certainly Ignatius, with his Spanish background and tradition,

was in many ways a man of the late middle ages, of the *devotio moderna*. Yet he was certainly also a man of modern times, of the era which has turned from cosmocentrism to anthropocentrism (to use J. B. Metz' terms), to man, who treats himself and his world in a rationally ordered way with a view to an open future, to a missionary commitment considered as a personal responsibility in the Church. There had always been apostolic men in the Church, but the particular quality in the relationship of the apostle to the Church presented by Ignatius had not appeared before. Ignatius was at the turning point between the ancient and medieval Church and the modern Church. Perhaps we ourselves, even today, are in many respects still Christians of the medieval Church who are only now beginning to understand what had its beginnings with Ignatius and Francis de Sales. There was a shift toward an existential ethic, toward an "option" in which the subject in one way or another exists in his act of deciding, in which he reflects, deliberates, chooses, and is not simply called by God without reflecting on himself. There was a shift toward the self's taking charge of the self. And yet Ignatius attained a permanence going beyond the conditions affecting this modern world. Despite his subjective concern with salvation and the predominance he gave to subjective over objective piety, despite his founding an order which was no longer a collectivity in the manner of the medieval orders—still, Ignatius remained a man of the Church. We are not wrong in seeing in his motto "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam" something that had not been grasped and expressed anywhere or at any time before him.

4) There are four elements in the attitude expressed by the motto. The first is obedience. The formula expresses the desire to submit to the sovereign will of God. One is ready to carry out the will of God and in so doing to honor God and his sovereignty. This requires that one examine, choose, and accomplish certain things. Here the second element is involved: one finds himself already placed in a particular situation. He does not purely and simply determine everything himself. Some things he finds already determined. A created liberty always has antecedents; man's free action in history always requires him to insert himself into what is already given; his disposition of himself must always take into account the facticity of his own person, life, age, temperament, etc. One says by the phrase, "I wish to lead my life for the greater glory of God," that he expects a command from God, and that he is seeking, in all openness, to find out in what this order might consist. But he also says that in the most essential matters this command has already come. The scope of my choices for God's greater glory is not unlimited. Thirdly he says that his condition as "called" is

constantly changing. One day he is well; the next he is ill; today he has one thing to do; tomorrow another. Man's disposition in the hands of God is constantly changing. Obedience becomes part of the historical character of our human existence—in ever new, unforseen, and unforeseeable ways. "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam" does not mean that one plans his life once and for all by an a priori principle. It means essentially that he is not so much the one making the plan as the one receiving it, the one whom God has already affected and whom he continues day by day to affect.

The man who knows that God has already made a disposition of him and that he is to accept in obedience the continually new dispositions from God as they come to him in the course of the history of his life, a course which surpasses all particular projects within that life, can truly let things come to him. This letting-things-come is an essentially Christian attitude. For only that liberty is truly a Christian liberty which, nothwithstanding its power to determine itself and the project by which it in some way gives direction to life, recognizes itself as created, i.e., as a liberty already given an orientation. To let God dispose of our life and to accept in obedience the unpredictability of our life—this belongs to the essence of Christian life.

In the concept of the *major Dei gloria* there enters the express, conscious decision to order one's life which remains along with the fact that man must enter into the working out of God's ordinances which surpass him, accept them, and, in a sense, not make any plan of his own. This is the fourth element in the structure of the attitude of the *major Dei gloria*—this clearly seen and deliberately maintained openness of the power to determine and plan. In the formula "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam" the *ad* should be stressed. The *major Dei gloria* is not so much something already done as the perspective in which we must keep all our actions so as to transcend them by this very openness and expansiveness.

We find ourselves here faced with one of our original difficulties—either the motto involves something that belongs to every Christian existence or it does not involve anything essential at all. But this is a false dilemma. There are realities essential to Christian life which are to be found wherever Christianity exists, but which need not be always grasped with the same degree of explicitness or embodied with the same degree of effectiveness. This is the case with our fourth element.

In summary thus far: the subjectivity of the subject becomes an object for the subject and not simply a modality of the fact of self-fulfilment. This represents something typically modern. The motto "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam" appeared only in modern times, along

with the meaning and seriousness which subjectivity too acquired only in the modern epoch. The subject's subjectivity has not always been an object for its subject in the sense in which modern man takes it. This is why the vaster range of potentialities beyond what is present here and now, beyond, that is, what God has already arranged, has not always been an object of reflection for the human subject.

Moreover, this fourth element has a part to play in providing a critique of the facticity of the decision being considered. Everyone has met people whose "hyperreflectivity" makes them fall from piety into neurosis. They lose confidence in their own personal temperament and inclinations and try to make their choice "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam" in a sort of vacuum. The more genuinely Ignatian way of making an election, however, is not the mere tabulation of reasons for and against a choice. In the Exercises and in the motto we find something like an existential moral attitude of man, i.e., an openness to what one can not essentially or rationally or abstractly calculate or deduce. There is to be found in this formula the end of legalism and the liberty of the children of God in the Spirit of Christ. Man, knowing himself to be called, responds to the sovereign and free disposition of God. We do not mean to say that Christianity only really began with this modern attitude of Ignatius; we mean simply that something specifically Christian is here for the first time expressed and made visible.

Jesuits are often reproached for being rationalists. This is not strictly a reproach. Rationalism is as legitimate an attitude as any other. But the surprising thing is that for Ignatius, his mystical personality led him to contemplate the absolute sovereignty of God without at all identifying it with any activity or passivity of man; and as a consequence of this experience of the "ever greater" God, he had always to ask himself regarding everything he did, however good it was, whether there might be something greater, less out of proportion to God. This attitude, born, in a way, of an a-rational mysticism and a rigorous existentialism, can end up, if it is not permeated with spontaneity, in the rationalism of a false pragmatism. As for what is truly Ignatian in regard to every offer and every demand, there is nothing that makes sense other than to leave the last word to God.

"Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam," then, means the effort always to judge the glory of God that we have brought about by the greater glory of God which could be accomplished, in order to remain always open and ready, without being able to see ahead of time, to bring about a "different" glory of God as he asks it of us in a different moment of our life.

R. C. C.

HOW TO GET RID OF HISTORY

religious renewal and the tyranny of the past

JOHN W. O'MALLEY, S.J.

RELIGIOUS RENEWAL IN THE CHURCH and the Society cannot today be expected to expend time and energy on nostalgic recall of the past. The contemporary world moves too fast and its problems are too urgent for us to be able to indulge ourselves with anything that smacks of antiquarianism or sentimentality. Renewal concerns the present and the future. It does not concern the past, which by definition is dead and gone. We must resolutely turn our backs on a history which is, after all, only history.

At the same time we perforce find ourselves looking to the past for help in answering our present questions. We do this, for one reason, because we have no alternative. The present is already gone, swallowed into the vortex of the past in the very instant of its first actuality. Whether we are dealing with St. Thomas or with the latest book just off the press we are dealing with realities already consigned to yesterday. The difference between the two is only one of degree. The future, of course, is forever beyond us, and those who would dedicate their lives to charting its course are prophets without honor in anybody's country. The present and the future, in other words, elude our grasp. We turn to the past in desperation, because we have no other place to turn. It provides us with our only data.

These are, therefore, the two horns of the present dilemma: we want to be rid of the dead past, but at the same time we see that in

some way or other it is only to the past we can look if the present religious renewal is to be a reasonable and thoroughly Christian undertaking. We are face to face with the problem of history. In this context I should like to present for consideration some personal reflections on the nature and purpose of history and historical studies.

The historian's understanding of the past

In the interest of good semantics we must begin by making the usual tiresome, but absolutely fundamental, distinction upon the word history: 1) the actuality or data of the past which the historian investigates, i. e., actual past reality; 2) the historian's reflections upon this reality, especially as these are committed by him to writing, i. e., history in the sense of the historian's understanding of the past. In other words, we might speak of the past as it actually was, *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*, and the past as the historian recaptures and reconstructs it in his imagination. Objective and subjective are other, inadequate, words to describe this same distinction.

As regards history taken in the second sense, i. e., the historian's understanding of the past, there is no need for me to elaborate upon the distance contemporary thought has gone in emphasizing the subjective element which enters into every historian's study of the past. We are today as far as we could possibly be from believing that von Ranke's ideal that the historian recapture the past *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist* is a reasonable or feasible one. The past, in any of its particulars, is too rich and complicated as a concrete reality to be contained within any historian's thought and imagination. Whatever else is to be said about an historian's understanding of the past, it always remains *his* understanding. He puts *his* questions to the past. He views the past in the light of *his* experience. He forces it into the categories he has at *his* disposal. He limits the past according to *his* limitations, so that it is now bound on north, east, south and west by *him*.

In the light of this consideration we see how precarious is the distinction so often made between an historian's presentation of the "facts" and his "interpretation." This distinction is not entirely without basis, for there invariably is some brute data which forces itself upon the historian, do what he will. On the other hand, the historian for the most part creates even his "facts" by deciding what the

questions are which he will ask the past. Documents do not speak. They are tight-lipped and devious. They surrender their truth only under torture, and for this torture is required an experienced and merciless hand. Every honest historian, after finishing his research on a given topic, must feel like throwing up his hands in despair and asking himself if the response he evoked from his data really bears any relationship to the subject he set out to explain.

It should be clear how pertinent this methodological reflection is to the question of religious renewal. We speak glibly of the "true mind of St. Ignatius" on such and such a point, as if this were recoverable in its integrity, even in some limited area, by any one of us. The "mind of St. Ignatius," *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*, simply is not recoverable. It will always be somebody else's understanding of that mind, and, hence, impoverished or enriched according to the poverty or richness of the mind which is doing the investigating. An historian's interpretation of St. Ignatius' thought, consequently, is valid or "true" insofar as it takes into account more of the data, has worked itself more deeply into the problematic of Ignatius' age and answers more of the pertinent questions.

The problem of the "pertinent questions" is crucial. It is these questions which do much to change interpretations over the course of the years. As the questions change, so does the "true mind" of St. Ignatius. What St. Ignatius' teaching on prayer was for the devotionalism of the nineteenth century is no longer the same for the liturgical twentieth century.

The Ignatian data has remained more or less the same, but our questions are different. Our questions are different because we are different. Our outlook, our interests, our very personalities are saturated with the world of today. Our style of thought, therefore, contrasts with the style of the nineteenth century, and in some ways it even contradicts it. To say this is certainly to say something other than that there has been a homogeneous development in our understanding of Ignatian teaching on prayer in the course of the past hundred years. It comes close, in fact, to saying just the opposite. Rather than speak of development of doctrine, we can better speak of continuity of data and discontinuity of insight.

Obviously, the range within which interpretation can maneuver is not limitless. First of all, there is a basic structure in human in-

quiry which time does not alter and which precludes absolute discontinuity in understanding. Moreover, in any given instance there is always a certain hard core of data which acts upon the historian just as certainly as he acts upon it. The Jesuit *Constitutions* are not identical in message with the *Rule of St. Benedict*, and no historian of sound mind can confound the two. Nevertheless, we cannot underestimate the subjective element which is involved in the historical enterprise. History, taken in the second sense of the word, is always *our* history, as understood by *our* minds and at the service of *our* questions.

In an excellent article in *Christus* entitled "L'épreuve du temps" (n. 51, July 1966, pp. 311–331) Fr. Michel de Certeau, S.J., discusses this methodological problem. He puts the matter succinctly: "En changeant, nous changeons le passé" (p. 314). For our purposes it is enough simply to point out the problem and to direct the reader to de Certeau's article for a sensitive exploration of it. We can, therefore, turn our attention to history taken in the first sense, i. e., as past actuality.

History as past actuality

The fact that history cannot be recovered by the historian *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist* should not lead us to think that it therefore automatically falls into the category of the "dead" past. First of all, it does provide in the monuments and documents it has left behind the data upon which the historian works. If it cannot be recovered in its fulness and richness by the historian's intelligence and imagination, it can be recovered at least partially and with qualification. Men have believed for a long time that such a recovery is useful and helpful to them.

There is, however, a much more important reason why we cannot categorize this past actuality as "dead": it every moment exercises a powerful causality upon us. Nothing, in this sense, is less past than the past. Nothing is less dead. Nothing is more dynamic. The *past* is the cause of the *present*. What we ate this morning, what we exposed ourselves to on last night's T-V commercial, what we heard and saw and suffered when we were children—these are all active forces upon us *now*. These are here and now making us be what we are.

The power of the past is all-pervasive, but it is especially impor-

tant in the intellectual sphere. Illustrative of the past's power to infiltrate unobserved into our thought is the old story of the Yankee farmer who read Plato's *Republic* for the first time. When asked what he thought of it, he replied, "Good book! That fellah has a lot of my own ideas."

The power of the past in religious thought is of incalculable importance. Even today it is impossible, for instance, to be a Christian in the Western Church and not think and feel in Augustinian terms. We have imbibed Augustine's thought, attitudes, and problems since the day we heard our first sermon, if not before. It may have been a weak and adulterated Augustine, but it was Augustine all the same.

The fact is, therefore, that the past holds us in its grasp. It holds us *here and now*. The most dramatic contemporary illustrations of this fact is in the technique of depth psychology. The client is made to review his past history. This long review is undertaken in the conviction that some past experience or set of experiences is the unknown or half-known agent which is responsible for present disturbances. The neurotic or psychotic person has allowed himself to become the toy or plaything of a despotic master, his own past. The fact that this past is only dimly remembered, or has even been deliberately repressed, does not decrease its power over the person. As a matter of fact, it increases it, and forces him to strike out blindly at unseen and unknown enemies, thus dissipating his energy and augmenting his terror.

The *past* is the great *present* force. The past is the omnipotent active agent which holds us tightly in its hands. It is a delusion to think that we have any great freedom to determine our tastes, our styles, our judgments. Americans abroad, for example, remain Americans, products of America. We are so accustomed to this phenomenon that we do not reflect upon it. What at times is disconcerting, however, is suddenly to realize that in some judgment one has made or in some preference one has indicated, as expression of one's own personality—that this was, when all the trappings have been stripped away, an *American* judgment, an *American* preference. Our history, not our independent-of-history personalities, expressed itself.

We must admit, consequently, that the past has ever been active

upon us, and is acting upon us here and now. It has formed us every moment up to the present, and is continuing to form us. We are what we are because of what we were and what we did. We are what we are because of what *others* were, thought, and did. This is the tyranny of the past.

The past is a tyranny. It is a despotism. In some instances it may be a benevolent despotism. In other instances it may be a malevolent despotism. But it is a despotism. It is control from without. It is a force which restricts our freedom. Without our being aware of its presence it clouds our vision of the present by forcing us to view the present with categories and assumptions we have absorbed from the past without being able critically to reflect upon them. This is what is particularly offensive about the past's power over us: it hampers our ability to control the present and to prepare in a rational way for the future. The obvious question, therefore, is how we can liberate ourselves from the past. How can we get rid of history?

How to get rid of history

One possible solution to the problem of history is simply to ignore the past. We can close our eyes and hope the past will go away. This is a false solution. It is based on the principle that by an act of the will we can wipe out the past's influence over us. We can simply pronounce that we have no use for all that outdated stuff, and by such a pronouncement we cancel the tyrant's power. Our very pronouncement qualifies us for membership in the theological jet-set, and it *ex opere operato* infuses into our innocent souls the highest of all the mystical graces, relevancy.

This solution, which certainly does not lack adherents, is beset with difficulties. The most obvious of these difficulties is that it does not know the enemy it has pronounced against. The past is much too subtle and tenacious an enemy to be put to flight by anyone's *exeat*. It often lurks hidden in the very sanctuary from which it has recently been solemnly exorcized.

A further consequence of this ignorance-solution is that, as a person comes to realize that the past is not so easily done away with as he first thought, he begins to rage against it. He comes to hate his past. He wants to strike out at it, and in fury he would destroy it if possible. He assumes the easy and ugly role of iconoclast.

Blows struck at the past in this blind fashion, however, are not terribly effective, for they are rarely directed at the past where it most subtly—and, hence, most effectively—is lodged.

Ignorance, therefore, is not the solution. There is only one way to be liberated from the past, and that is the way of scientific study of it. *To liberate us from the past* is, in my opinion, the purpose of historical studies. Only by studying history can we get rid of it, and to get rid of it is precisely why we study it.

"History" and "historical studies," as the terms are used here, must be broadly defined, and would include the study of Scripture, literature, philosophy, theology, art, social and economic phenomena—in general, all that falls outside the strict categories of mathematics and the physical sciences. According to the contemporary practice of the academic world, all the Humanities are studied by methods which, broadly speaking, can be described as historical. The historical method, taken again in this broad sense, is *the* contemporary method. All the humanities employ it.

The method has as its purpose the attainment of an understanding of some person, event, or document of the past. The more limited the subject of this act of understanding is the better it is, for it thus admits of better control. If it is a worth-while subject, it will at the same time fan out one's interests to include and to bring into focus an immense amount of data and a wide range of questions. A good subject will force the scholar to sum up what has preceded it and enable him to understand the developments which followed from it.

A serious study of the past provokes an insight into the past. It yields an understanding of the past. And it is this understanding which is liberating. It is this understanding which brings the past under our control. It brings the past under our control because it shows us both the greatness and the limitations of past achievement, and it shows us how we have been produced from the past. By understanding the past we come to understand the present. We come to understand ourselves. We are liberated from the limitations of our own past because we now have that past in perspective and, consequently, have ourselves better in perspective. After the long hours on the analyst's couch an insight is unchained which enables the client to see why he is the way he is. The insight does

not solve his problem, but helps him to understand his problem. It puts him into a position where he can begin to solve or control it.

Relativizing the past

The great accomplishment of modern historiography is that it has produced an awareness that every person, event, and document of the past is culturally conditioned, which is just another way of saying that it is culturally limited. Such awareness distinguishes modern historiography from that which preceded it, and it is an awareness that has grown ever more acute since the nineteenth century. This development is strikingly illustrated in the field of Scripture scholarship. The text of Matthew's Gospel, for instance, is a text produced within the very specific culture of first-century Judaism. A completely different text would have been produced by the culture of fifteenth-century Humanism. It is this awareness of cultural differentiation which helps make Scripture scholars today much more keenly conscious of how Scripture is Word of Man than they are of how it is Word of God. Until quite recently quite the opposite was the case.

What modern historical method enables us to understand more clearly than was ever understood before, therefore, is that every person, event, and document of the past is the product of very specific and unrepeatable contingencies. This method thus contains these persons, events, and documents within very definite historical limits. By refusing to consider them as products of providence or as inevitable links in a preordained chain of historical progress or decline, it deprives them of all absolute character. It relativizes them.

The importance of such relativization is clear when we consider the alternative. If a reality of the past is not culturally relative, it is culturally absolute. It is sacred and humanly unconditioned. There is no possibility of a critical review of it which will release the present from its authoritative grasp. A classic example of this kind of absolutistic historical thinking is the belief in the eternity of the Roman empire, a belief which dominated political thought in Europe for a thousand years after the empire was dead there.

Modern historical method relativizes the past, and thus neutralizes it. Ignorance of the past allows the past to exercise control over us. Understanding of the past reverses the situation and puts us in

control. We are thus released from the tyranny of the past.

This control, limitation, neutralization, and relativization of the past does not in itself destroy our reverence for the past. If anything, it increases it. In studying the past we are forced, in our limited way, to re-experience the struggles and achievements of the past, and thus to make them our own. This is especially true in intellectual history. By a study of Augustine we are put in a position to relive and re-experience his insights. We cannot but be awed and reverent as our appreciation of his genius increases. In proportion to our own gifts we grow to his very stature and we participate in his wisdom.

In other words, we do "learn lessons" from the past, but we learn them in a way which puts us in a dynamic position. We have not simply uncovered and assimilated a granite block of timeless truth. We have, rather, brought ourselves up to the level of the past's achievement, and then put ourselves in a position to go beyond it. This is true whether we are studying Aristotle, Thomas, or someone as recent as Tillich.

We can go beyond the achievement even of a genius himself because we now have a perspective which he did not have. If our study has been successful, we see how he was formed, what his limitations were, how he was "cultually conditioned," and we see what flowed from his achievement. We also see how we ourselves fell, perhaps unsuspectingly, under his influence. Bernard of Chartres' observation that we are dwarfs sitting on the shoulders of giants is thus given a twentieth century meaning.

Concomitant with this sense of perspective, however, is awareness of the past's limitations, especially as understood in the sense that every person, event, and document of the past is culturally conditioned, the product of historical contingencies. The past is relativized. The consequences of such a relativization are frightening.

What does this relativization mean? It means, first of all, that the past has *no answers* to our present questions. An answer, in the sense the word is employed here, is a univocal thing. It is a univocal response to a univocal question. It of itself tells us what to do. It is pat, finite, and immediately satisfying. It puts to rest our misgivings and lets us sleep soundly at night. It lets us sleep the so-called sleep

of the just. And it is precisely this soporific remedy which a truly historical study of the past does not yield.

What the past yields is an understanding of the present. It cannot make our decisions for us. The past can help us discover who and what we are, and how we arrived at our present situation. It might even tell us who and what we should be, and in this wise clarify for us our vocational ideal. Such information should prove very enlightening by providing guidelines for the ordering of our lives. It puts us into a position to make intelligent and adult decisions. But it does not make the decisions for us. History is genetic. Times change. The past has no answers for us.

I assume that few would contend with what has so far been said. Most of us are convinced that it is as futile to ask Franklin Roosevelt what American foreign policy should be as it is to ask George Washington. Our present questions have no answers that can be lifted off the "ready-to-wear" racks of the past. We must, carefully and creatively, fashion them ourselves. What is pertinent to our present topic is to apply these reflections to the question of religious renewal and the problem of the Church today taken in its broadest sense.

We have already discussed the methodological problem of discovering the "true mind of St. Ignatius." However, once having exposed the problem, we can grant that there is a sense in which this "true mind" can be discovered on any given issue. Then what? All we can say is that we now better understand why we are the way we are. But we have found no ready-made answers to our *present* questions and to our *present* problems. We are simply in a better position to make *our* decision. The "true mind of St. Ignatius" does not solve our problems for us, nor does it tell us what to do. The same, of course, can be said of the decrees of the General Congregations, even of the most recent one. We are liberated from history only to be thrown on our own!

We are all familiar with the idea that to become a mature member of the Society, as of any other religious order or congregation, we must "become the founder again." This certainly must mean, as pointed out above, that we try in our imagination to relive his thoughts and experiences. Such an effort should increase our sympathy for the vocational ideal which he represents, and it should suggest that we try to measure ourselves in our daily life against

what is holy and selfless in him. The result of this effort insofar as it is historical, however, is that we arrive at a state of being as independent as the founder to make a free, adult, and Christian decision. We can no longer believe that *he* answered *our* questions. We can—we must—draw inspiration and guidance from the past, but we cannot treat it as if it were a vending machine of neat answers to our present questions.

Freed from the present

If a study of history relativizes the past, it also relativizes the present. It relativizes the past by showing it in its single instances to be a product of contingencies. It does the same thing for the present, which is the product of the past. It thus tempers our enthusiasm for the enthusiasms of the moment and enables us to see something of the limitations of our own times, our own culture, our own country. We become strangers in our own house. We are put in the painful position of being liberated not only from the past, but also from the present. We most certainly will still be passionately involved in current problems. But we will never be able to be so involved in them as not to be a critic of the very realities which engage us. We are condemned to live in a state of abiding cultural discontent. We find ourselves discontent with our history, our culture, our politics, our society, our profession, our vocation. We are discontent with the Church and the Society of Jesus. We are even discontent with ourselves. It is this very discontent which puts us in a position of potential leadership.

It is this discontent which makes the intellectuals real leaders in the human community. For better or for worse, it is the intellectuals —the "historians," in the sense we have described them—who have the future in their hands. This is true in spite of the widespread conviction in the Society that "administrators" are the leaders. In actual fact the vast majority of religious and civil administrators are, for a variety of reasons, *ex officio* conservatives. Their very function is to tend the store, and nobody wants a messy store. They thus provide a rein on the intellectual's latest bright idea, for they hate to upset a sure present good in exchange for an uncertain future good. At their worst, therefore, they are obstructionists. At their best, they prepare society at large for the impact of the bright idea, and they help mediate the idea to the institutions of society. This is an

important and necessary service, but it should not be confused with the leadership which the intellectual presumably provides. By his understanding of the past he finds himself in a condition of present freedom and discontent which spurs him, perforce, to fashion the world of the future. Ideas are power. Freud and Marx changed the world more than Chancellor Bismark did, and Jungmann and Murray change the Church more than Cardinal Spellman dreamed possible.

If the intellectual is a leader in the community, it is not hard to see how his function can be called "pastoral." The *pastor*, after all, is the shepherd who leads the sheep. In the case of the intellectual his function is to be otherwise minded. He raises questions, points out problems, and forces reflection upon the present situation. This is leadership in the raw. In this sense the intellectual's function is pastoral.

I certainly do not want to press the "pastoral" character of the scholar's life, nor to suggest that I want to exalt a life of scholarship for the Jesuit above the more direct exercise of the priestly ministry and Christian charity. The life of scholarship in the total context of the Church has, justly, a very modest position. To dedicate one's life to the lepers of Molokai is better than to discover that concelebration is more liturgically correct than the "private Mass." On the other hand, such discoveries are helpful for the Church, and it would be a very unhealthy situation if no members of the clergy were trained enough to make them, or even to recognize their importance once they were made by others.

No one wants to deny that there are problems inherent in the life of the priest-scholar (as in *all* lives), but at the same time we should not falsely pose these problems. Sometimes one hears a Jesuit renounce scholarship on the grounds that he "likes people" and wants "to work with people." This attitude seems to assume that the scholar takes a solemn vow of misanthropy, which is followed by sealing himself up forever in his monastic tower. One needs very little experience in the academic world to see that this is not the case, that the scholar has more effective contact with a wider range of people—great and humble—than do many of his "practical" counterparts. Moreover, in our present complex world it seems rather clear that he best helps "people" who is best equipped by his

training to offer creative leadership. For effective religious renewal we need people who are as freed from the present as they are from the past, and whose consequent perspective and discontent forces them to exercise such leadership.

The problem of a relativized past

There is no doubt that such a relativization of the past as we have been describing presents grave problems for any religious renewal. Historical consciousness is a modern phenomenon. No previous renewal in the Church ever had to face the problem of history. A good case can be made for the view that it is this problem, in its many ramifications, which is provoking the present crisis in the Church. We no longer see so clearly as men once did, for example, an easy harvest of eternal truths in every papal or conciliar decree. Our sense of history makes it difficult for us to recognize the eternal and the transcendent in a relativized past.

As believing Christians, of course, we are saved from total relativization. Belief in the divinity of Christ imparts to the New Testament a transcendence which even the sharpest sense of history may not reduce to its own level. This divinity-intruding-in-history continues in some mysterious way in the history of the Church, thus permeating it with a meaning above human meaning. It is the theologians who must tell us in detail what this means, and confirm our belief in the future of belief. We can only hope that they are theologians who are aware of the problem history presents.

As a practical point, it might be pertinent to point out, as others have done, that what has been lacking in the theological training of Jesuits, even on the doctoral level, has been a confrontation with this problem. I do not now intend to bewail the fact that more "history" has not been taught, although a very good case could be made to show the serious consequences of such a gap in our training. What I want to point out is that nothing, or practically nothing, has been taught historically.

Had St. Thomas, for example, been taught historically, in the sense here described, it is doubtful if today there would be such a reaction against him as we are now experiencing. How, indeed, could anybody be worse off for a year or two of study of one of the great geniuses of the western world? But it is one thing to study Saint Thomas out of scholastic textbooks in order to acknowledge

him as the omniscient philosophical and theological oracle of all times, and it is another to study him historically, i. e., in order to be liberated from him.

In conversation with students of theology who are ignorant of the history of theology one often has the impression that no gorup of people has been more heavily victimized by the past than they. In one sense they have been victimized by the *recent* past, i. e., by the last book they read. In another sense they have been victimized by the *distant* past, for they are incapable of seeing the context in which the present finds itself, and thus they are unable to evaluate it. Within ten years, one fears, they will be as outdated as the books they are now reading. Or, at best, they will be in no better position to evaluate what they are then reading than they are now. The history of theology shows, moreover, that only those have been original and creative, i. e., relevant, who immersed themselves in the study of their predecessors. In this the history of theology is no different from the history of every other academic discipline.

It is true that today there is more emphasis upon an historical approach in the theological curriculum than there was a few years ago, especially with greater attention to Biblical studies, which employ historical methods. It is, nevertheless, disconcerting to realize that even today the history of theology, without which systematic courses can hardly appear other than as a string of eternal verities, is not at the very core of the theological curriculum. Even more disconcerting is to discover, as one occasionally does, that there are scholars trained in historical methods, for instance in Scripture, who do not see the necessity of applying their own methods to the totality of the Christian tradition. There is a *Sitz im Leben* for the Council of Trent, and valid principles of form-criticism have application to the documents of the Church's magisterium. Why should not the historical study of the whole of the Christian tradition be given equal importance with the historical study of Scripture?

In a less sensitive and less grandiose area than the history of the Church and the problem of its doctrine, we might simply reflect upon the consequences of this relativization of the past in an organization like the Society. Once we relativize the "true mind of St. Ignatius" and then go a further step to conclude that, though he may help us, he has no answers for us, has not religious life, viz.,

religious life in the Society of Jesus, been sapped of all that gives it continuity and identity? Have not the intellectuals done their dirty work, and done it all too well? We are left with dust and ashes.

The scholar's limitations

Before trying to answer the problem raised in the religious life by the relativization of the past, we might offer some preliminary consolation to the reader by emphasizing just how dirty the intellectual's dirty work really is. The scrutiny the scholar turns upon the past is in many ways a negative and corrosive one. He is the real Devil's Advocate. Scholars as a class have never been known as the salt of the earth. Their craft is reflective and critical. As such it implies a certain decadence and degeneracy. The reflective age succeeds the age of achievement and creativity. The scholar succeeds the genius, the saint, and the artist. He is, after all, only a dwarf, even though he may enjoy the perspective which giants' shoulders offer him.

It is a poor scholar, consequently, who is not somewhat distrustful of what scholarship is now saying on any given point. He, of all people, knows a dwarf when he sees one. He will turn an attentive ear to the results of scholarly research, but by this time he is critical and reflective enough to be freed not only from past and present, but also from the latest results of scholarship itself. He does not commit the error of thinking that the latest book is the final word on any given topic, or that this book is not itself subject to revision and criticism. He is a friend of scholarship, but he does not worship at its shrine. He, in fact, disdains this shrine as a place of devotion frequented principally by non-scholars.

He also must recognize that scholarship is only one of the instruments at our disposal to help us order our lives in an adult and Christian manner. Another such instrument is the wisdom of actual experience, which often confutes the scholar's neat logic. Whatever else we might say about the Church, we must admit that it is the heir to a rich heritage of this practical wisdom. In some instances this wisdom is the result of the Church's persistent effort to reduce to practice the sophisticated religion of its great geniuses and saints. In other instances it may not rise much above the folk wisdom of the multitude of simple and anonymous souls who for the most part

have ever constituted its membership. In either case this inheritance or tradition, as seen in the Church's practice and in the lives and aspirations of its faithful, deserves equal hearing with the voice of scholarship. The good scholar realizes this. He thus learns to sweeten his discontent with tolerance and understanding.

Moreover, if he accepts the thesis that scholarship's task is a relativizing one, he sees quite clearly that scholarship does not of itself solve life's problems. We may think in a relativized world, but we cannot live in one. Existence is existential. It requires decision, and every decision is an absolute, an irreversible which excludes all other possibilities. At this point the scholar must renounce his dirty work. He must give up relativization and enter the world of absolutes. He must surrender his role as scholar and assume his role as man.

The vocational ideal

What the intellect, therefore, has relativized, the will must in its turn absolutize. The intellect is perfected by the many, but the will is perfected by the one. Love does not tolerate promiscuity, i. e., relativity. Out of many possible women a man chooses ONE to be his wife. This decision for the mature person is absolute and irrevocable. What good lives show us, furthermore, is that the firmer and more unswerving such a decision is, i. e., such a choice in love, the more beautiful, rich, and enriching is the person who made it. The salt of the earth are people of single and genuine loves, who have absolutized the relative object of their choice.

Strange to say, among the most important choices which life requires is that of form. For better or for worse, man lives according to set patterns. It is these patterns which hold his life together and help make him what he is. Form forms.

We all have our habits. We have our schedules and our office hours. We have our national and our religious traditions. We live, whether we advert to the fact or not, within established patterns of ritual. These patterns are to a great extent arbitrary and are directed towards something beyond themselves. But they are not insignificant. Only by moving within their framework do we get our work done and maintain our mental and physical health. More important, only by moving within their framework do we remember who we are. To be uprooted from the style and rubrics to which

one is accustomed is to lose something of one's identity.

A religious vocation entails the choice of a form of life. This choice absolutizes for the individual the style and rubrics, i. e., the form, of the way of life he has chosen. Part of the Jesuit style, for instance, is life in community, with all the rubrics this necessarily brings in its train.

Style and rubrics are certainly open to change and modification, even to drastic change and modification. We ought, furthermore, to relativize or "de-mystify" them. At the same time we must realize that no one can live without style and rubrics, and that for us the Jesuit style and rubrics constitute part of what we call our vocation. By our choice of a particular form of life we have conferred upon that arbitrary form an absolute value. For us it is to be the framework of the only irreversible absolute which we directly experience, our own lives.

This framework, however, is only a framework. Its function is to support something better than itself. In our case it is meant to support the vocational ideal. It contains, expresses, and fosters this ideal. The ideal, in turn, imparts life and meaning to the framework.

What is a vocational ideal? A vocational ideal is that which tells us who and what we should be. It tells us who and what we really want to be. At first glance it looks like an "answer," but it really is not one. It is as sloppy as an answer is neat. It is vague, leaves a lot of loose ends, and sometimes disturbs our sleep. It does not make our decisions for us, but pushes us into a corner where we constantly have to make decisions.

The vocational ideal expresses a value which appeals directly to our humanity and sense of religion. Thus it is an absolute. It may already have found an historical expression, and it may respond more directly to the needs of one age than to those of another. But it is essentially unattached to a particular time and place, which would relativize it. It cannot be altogether rationally justified. It is a desire to give oneself in love. To spend one's life in the service of the sick poor is an example of such an ideal. One sees this as a good or one does not. One is attracted to it or one is not. The vocational response to it, in any case, is like any response in love: it absolutizes the object of its choice.

It is difficult to say just how a vocational ideal is first inserted into any given individual's imagination and aspirations. The magic of his mother's goodness may have been the context in which it was suggested to him for the first time. We can be certain, in any case, that a formal study of history usually has very little to do with its inception. A vocational ideal, as ideal, is just as far above historical research as it is beyond rational justification. Francis of Assisi was no less a saint due to the fact that he never met a Bollandist.

For the member of an already constitued religious order, however, the relationship of his vocational ideal to history becomes a burning issue. As a member of an order he professes to be the bearer of a tradition, i. e., of a vocational ideal which at some particular moment of history was concretized, specified, and embodied in a particular historical person or group of persons. He at one time felt attracted enough to this ideal, as seen in the life of the founder and the accomplishments of the order, to dedicate his life to it. But the problem is clear: as the ideal was historically realized in the founder was it not *ipso facto* relativized, i. e., compromised by its attachment to particular circumstances of time and place? Ignatius spoke to the sixteenth century, but can he speak to the twentieth?

To respond to this question we must recur to the distinction between answer and ideal. The historical particularization of the ideal in the life of the founder makes it incapable of yielding answers. The "true mind of St. Ignatius" answers none of our questions. This particularization, however, does not destroy or defile the ideal. As a matter of fact, it lends encouragement to the ideal by showing how the ideal was actually made effective in one particular set of circumstances. The historical particularization of the ideal in the life of the founder was, moreover, the classic articulation of the ideal. Hence, it has a purity and directness which invites our study and has every right to command our reverence.

The point that must be emphasized, however, is that an ideal remains an ideal. Insofar as it is pure ideal it is supra-historical, appealing directly to our humanity and sense of religion. What historical study can attempt to do is to extract the quintessence of the ideal from its historical context. It can chip away at that which accrued to it from particular circumstances and try to reveal it as the religious absolute which it is. It can suggest changes of the form,

i. e., of the style and rubrics, in which the ideal here and now tries to express itself. In this way it refines, purifies, and clarifies the ideal for us. The ideal entered history in the life of the founder, but it is freed from history by our study of it. It thus defies history and helps us get rid of history.

POSTCONCILIAR PARISH

The Postconciliar Parish *Edited by James O'Gara*, Afterword by Archbishop Paul J. Hallinan. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1967. Pp. 197. $4.95.

Despite any more than a casual consideration of parishes in Vatican Council II, the American parish is of late increasingly the topic of published works. Bernard Lyons has written and Divine Word Publications put forth *Parish Councils*. James J. McCudden has edited *The Parish in Crisis*, also published by Divine Word. Richard Currier has written *Restructuring the Parish* (Argus Press, Chicago). Msgr. Marvin Bordelon has edited *The Parish in a Time of Change* for Fides Publishers, Notre Dame. The present book, *The Postconciliar Parish* is another evidence of growing American parish concern.

Along with all other parts of the Catholic world, the American parish is being sifted as wheat. In this book Daniel Callahan sums up the complaints against it, in a list as good as any, as "too big and too impersonal; most suffer from poor communication between pastor and people, priests and people; most spend too much of their time worrying about money and facilities; most operate with the burden of lay societies and organizations that have no contemporary significance." He also mentions the mobility of today's people, class and educational differences, and the great variations among priests. Others accuse the parish of not sufficiently concerning itself with secular problems. These and many more problems are dealt with in this slim volume, made up of the writings of nineteen individuals or groups ranging from Martin Marty to Archbishop Paul J. Hallinan, and divided inadequately into three sections, *Perspectives*, *Some Realities*, and *Projections*.

In a good foreword James O'Gara, editor of *Commonweal*, poses the parish's problems, cautiously stating that, in the changing world, all is not well with the parishes, yet affirming that there is no reason to fear reevaluating them. Bishops are of divine institution, but parishes are human and, therefore, subject to change. O'Gara, though he is obviously well aware of it in his article, somehow does not make clear the realization that the parish—pilgrim in nature, with its roots in the Acts of the Apostles and with changes, evolutionary and revolutionary, evident in the ages past—has constantly adapted and will keep on adapting in order to fit the times. Rightly, though, he would like more motion today, after a period of great parish immobility, and he is anxious to stimulate the rate and accuracy of the change.

Perspectives, the first main division of *The Postconciliar Parish*,

might perhaps also be called *Background*. In it, Fr. Henry Browne, in "The Changing American Parish," skims lightly and knowledgeably over the surface of the history of the American "juridical-minded parish," lamenting that parishes are condemned to repeat history because of a prevalent ignorance of it. Moving onto present problems, Browne touches on the inroads made nowadays by the great social and econnomic changes of urban society. These changes as well as the basic thoughts of Vatican II appear to be moving the parish toward a time of smaller worshiping communities supported by the operation of centralized regional social services.

Joseph E. Cunneen, in "The Servant Parish," is mindful of the role of the parish in providing our basic education as Christians. He emphasizes the parish's clear obligation to social service for all who live in its boundaries, and he goes beyond the idea of forming Catholic regional social services to state the belief that the Church may have to stop trying to maintain its own total range of activities at all. Catholics should perhaps move into broader, even national, groupings and thus exert a Christian influence on all. Cunneen also wisely calls attention to "the current estrangement of our most responsible apostolic groups from parish involvement."

Martin Marty, the American Church's good Lutheran friend, shows that, through such Catholic effort to enter larger associations, the Catholic Church is in fact losing its air of mystery, isolation and self-sufficiency and is becoming better understood by Protestants. Michael E. Schiltz, in "Facing Outward," an article reminiscent of the old-style *casus conscientiae*, strives to show that the parish as such cannot rightly involve itself in community controversies and that Catholics as a people should perhaps form their own community organizations apart from parish control.

More needed on spiritual renewal

Strangely undeveloped by the writers of this book is the need for spiritual renewal, set down by the Church as the basic demand of *aggiornamento*. Leonard Swidler mentions it in his article on ecumenism, but Fr. Timothy McCarthy, O.P., comes closest to articulating this need in "The 'Spiritual Service Station'." Moving against the tide, McCarthy pleads with spirit that "a parish is and should be what Fr. Fichter . . . calls a 'spiritual service station'," intending that "this is not all it should be, but that it should be this." The service of priests is spiritual and their ministry is an effort to help people to love. This very love will help them build a Christian community and will urge Christians on to support the world's social needs. Sr. M. Angelica Seng, O.S.F., in "A

Nun-Plus Parish" sets her thoughts on an ideal future for nuns as members of the parish, and at the same time she realizes that they remain committed to the actual Church of today and that there is much room for experimentation within present structure and commitment.

Some Realities, section two of the book in its inadequately fulfilled division of thought, fact and future, concerns itself with existing realities. In it, Fr. Jasper J. Chiodini's "Vatican II in Suburbia" pleads for the growth of a sense of shared responsibility and of interpersonal relations among bishops, pastors, curates, school faculty and laity, and he goes on to show the actual functioning of his Parish Board at St. Dominic Savio in suburban St. Louis. Fr. James J. Hill of Presentation Parish, Chicago, sets forth the working of the team-type operation of a parish, as Fr. Daniel J. Mallette did earlier in his article on the Inner City. Fr. Joseph T. Nolan writes out his own valid list of parish defects and goes on to describe eight successfully operating, different, modern American parishes. Nolan wisely warns that the parish chef who is a true artist will create his own recipe for his own parish.

Projections, the third section of the volume, returns again to the dream, the ideal, the abstract. Daniel Callahan in "Creating a Community" notes two failures characteristic of too many of today's parishes—they succeed in making a large number of people feel isolated and they do not try to make most people feel that they are full, active partners. As those who attended the 1967 National Liturgical Week know, Callahan believes that relevant change in liturgy will follow, not precede, the creation of a viable, human community. Therefore, the vitality of a parish's human relationships must be improved. With the priest leading and guiding, a feeling of community, of a living sense of responsibility for the parish, "that is for each other," must be formed. To enable the priest to do this, the parishioners or a representative group should learn to take over responsibility for parish finances and administration. The priest would then be free to develop a wide range of small organizations very largely run by the people, and the priest would also labor to forge the individuals and all these small groups into a broad, decision-making body. The parish should also extend its interest and responsibility to the diocesan, national and international levels. Incidentally, while stressing the need of much that is new, Callahan also has good things to say for the geographically based parish.

Doris Grumbach in "Parish Organizations" has her mind too much on forming cultural groups, too little on the religious, and, impatient in her elimination of the need for priests in parish organizations, goes on to state many of the same ideas as Callahan but in a less tolerant way. To Fr. Gerard S. Sloyan in "The Parish as Educator" the parish is sig-

nificantly the center of religious organization, an education that must in every way be improved through good sermons, good catechetical instruction, good renewal courses in sacred sciences for priests, good adult education, good parish or regional schools of religion. To Sloyan the parish has no rival yet in bringing the Word of God to men. "Nothing but the parish as a religious educator will ever make a Christian people of us."

Sisters on education

Two Sisters, Sr. M. Teresa Francis McDade, B.V.M., and Sr. M. Richardine Quirke, B.V.M., in "The Parish School," give an excellent paper on this vital topic. They foresee a future parish school much like its predecessor of the last one-hundred and fifty years, one that stresses the love of neighbor as well as the love of God. The Sisters struggle with basic questions such as: "Ought there be some new creative approach to educational organization within the parish, the diocese, the total Church?"; "Should the adolescents and adults within the parish be neglected in order to provide Catholic education for the children of the flock, and only about half their number at best?" They hold that the total educational program of the parish must be reevaluated, with the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine program and adult education programs made an integral part of the whole.

Fr. John J. Ryan in a rough sketch in which "the practical problems are unresolved," criticizes even today's advancing liturgy. In his "Post-Tribal Worship" Ryan maintains that the expressions of the liturgy no longer fit the culture of this age. To him this is tentatively "the Age of the Person," of the man of "encounter," "commitment," "involvement," who needs revealed truth and for whom "the good is something yet to be done, the truth something to be *made*." The future liturgy must grow in controlled experiments from the community's expression of its real needs and possibilities.

Leonard Swidler, "Ecumenism in the Parish," brings the reader up to date with activities in this misunderstood and needed form of prayerful preparation for a dreamed-for unity of Christians. The editors of *Commonweal* in "The Parish—Tomorrow" imagine their dream-parish of the future, one that will be smaller, more informal, designed to care for a shifting populace, administered by elected lay boards in charge of both facilities and finances and in which the celibate, full-time clergy will be assisted by a married, part-time priesthood. Archbishop Hallinan closes the book with an afterword, warning that "the world is watching Catholics to see whether Vatican II made any difference" and stating that "a decent optimism is in order" because more people

are now concerned about their parishes.

The Postconciliar Parish is milder in its overall tone than one would expect of such a book in the midst of the present anti-institutional storms swirling in parts of the Church. It has good words to say about the old geographical parish as well as about newer supplementary types of parishes. It states well the central role of the bishop in parishes. It recommends study before making drastic changes (and incidentally such study has already begun in Baltimore's *Urban Parish Study* and St. Louis' *Mission : Profile*). It warns parish priests of the dangerous understanding-gap forming between Newman Apostolate and Catholic-college groups, renewed nuns, seminarians, Catholic high school and parochial school students on the one hand and the routine practices of their less progressive home parishes on the other. It reminds the readers, too, of the serious need these days to re-educate priests, not least of all parish priests. It provokes thought and should, then, be read, if not always agreed with. All seriously concerned with keeping parishes healthy today and in the future would profit by studying this book.

FRANCIS J. TIERNEY, S.J.

CHANGE FOR RELIGIOUS

Change not Changes . . . New Directions in Religious Life and Priesthood, *C. J. McNaspy, S.J.* New York: Paulist Press, 1968. Pp. 164. $1.95.

Change not Changes IS A HIGHLY PERSONAL WORK, reflecting quite accurately the author's lived experience of many years as a Jesuit, as a priest and as a friend. Anyone who knows "C.J." at all knows him as a notorious friend of hundreds of "younger" Jesuits, those under thirty—at least in spirit! As an editor of *America* for many years, Fr. McNaspy has always been ahead of the game, in the forefront of the liturgical renewal of the past decade. And as anyone who sniffs snuff must, he has a reverence for and loyalty to the past and to the traditions of the past, in particular to those traditions that define the Society of Jesus. With these qualifications it is no surprise that he has succeeded so well in doing what he set out to do in writing this book. Out of his own experience and his participation in the numerous conferences and institutes sponsored by Jesuit colleges and theologates in the last five years he has distilled the spirit at work in shaping the development and redirection of religious life, reflection of the Spirit that gives meaning to all Christian forms of life and who must be obeyed at the risk of

spiritual death. He is intimately aware of the present shape of religious life and of the directions in which it is moving. At the same time he has always insisted on perceiving the essential continuity that underlies the development of an organic whole such as a religious community or congregation. Because he has kept his sights on both change and continuity, and not been afraid to accept both, he has succeeded in becoming "some sort of inter-generational bridge" bridging the communications gap between "old" and "young" religious.

I would like to summarize briefly the overall structure of the book and highlight some of the key chapters, thus giving the flavor and quality of Fr. McNaspy's thought which is, I think, the particular importance of the book. Chapter II, "Change and Continuity," situates the religious life and the priesthood in a socio-anthropological framework. Change in the religious life is rooted in the "new man" and the "new style of life" that has emerged as a result of the social and cultural transformations of our time. Changes in institutions must mirror this new anthropology or "frustrate man's truest aspirations." "If the anthropology underlying the structure of a religious community or seminary is unrelated to the persons entering the institution and for whom the institution exists, it is unlikely to prove a genuine means to Christ's service". The remaining chapters of the book explore this new anthropology along the various dimensions that define the religious life. Chapter III is an excellent treatment of a dimension of life, "Commitment," that avoids an overly idealistic or an overly literalistic conception of its subject. To understand the meaning "commitment" has for the present day religious, one must come to grips with the pragmatism which is "in his bones"and his personalism expressed in service to the person of Christ within a group working together to witness to that Christ. Chapter IV, "Community," clearly points out that the spirit of any group, its particular *mystique*, though partially expressed in written rules and customs, is rooted in a living "oral tradition." "The interpersonal relationships the members establish, the communication that goes on among them, the thoughts, feelings and imponderables that they share over a period of years, are what matter most in community development."

Chapter V, "Personal Development," presents a conclusion which is in contrast to earlier ways of thinking and training concerning the role of emotionality in the life of active religious. "It may be that our own effectiveness will be closely proportionate to our affectiveness." Chapters VII and X on "Obedience and Authority" and "Poverty" reflect the problems and difficulties associated with all thought on

the vows of obedience and poverty. They might both be read under the rubric of "uncertainty" attached to the discussion of poverty at the Santa Clara Conference. "Whatever theory we follow or whatever our practise may be, we have in our lives an important area of *lived contradiction*" (emphasis is mine). It seems to this reader at least, that it is in these areas that the attempted reconciliation between tradition and change is put to the greatest strain. It is not that Fr. McNaspy has failed to present an accurate evaluation of where we are at present and what directions we might go in, but that the lived contradictions mentioned before are still so prominent in the life of religious institutions that no one could be expected to make satisfactory sense out of them. It may be that here at least, only "radical" change will succeed in restoring the integrity of traditional religious life. Chapter IX on "Liturgy" relates liturgical changes to the fundamental change in our perspective on Christ. As our vision has broadened to include the life of the historical Jesus within the mystery and presence of the Risen Christ, so too the liturgy "is no longer something mainly awesome, so vertical and elevated as to seem more a climax or reward of spiritual life; rather, it is the very center, the focus of that spiritual life." To complete the picture there are chapters on prayer, spiritual direction, and programs of formation filled with all sorts of insights and helpful suggestions for those responsible for the formation of religious.

Admittedly much of what the author has given us is not original. The grace, balance and enthusiasm that marks the presentation and the continual bits of relevant information and insight that light up every page of this book are, however, quite original. In addition there are several unique perspectives which inform the whole. First of all, renewal in religious life is seen as supremely important not because of any abstract imperative to "adapt" to the modern world or "to keep up with the times" or to preserve the institution. Its importance lies in the concrete imperative of all Christian witness, that of re-specifying the work of Christ in our world. This is the basic goal of all religious renewal and all changes are judged in terms of their adequacy to accomplish that mission. Secondly, Fr. McNaspy's wide-ranging interests and comprehensive vision are obvious on every page. His grasp of social change is nuanced by a broad knowledge of the disjunctions that mark our culture: the inter-age gap, the youth culture, the problems of prolonged adolescence as they affect the religious. His knowledge of the sociology and psychology of groups support his strong endorsement of continual dialogue and participative decision-making and leadership. Finally and most important of all of the qualities of his

thought, Fr. McNaspy knows "whereof he speaks." When he talks about the frustrations, contradictions, fears, and joys of religious life, he talks as one who has been there himself and who "tells it like it is." He offers no pious platitudes, nominal answers, scholastic solutions.

Many facile commentators have have asked whether religious life is still a viable form of Christian witness today. Declining numbers of vocations and wide-spread anxiety and confusion among religious over their identity and mission incline many to give a negative answer. Fr. McNaspy does not choose to ask this question, and so he is not predetermined to give a positive or negative answer. One does not really ask the question *whether* the religious life should be at all; the answer to that question can only be provided by the future history of religious life and in that history the believer will discern the answer of the Spirit. *Change not Changes* does however ask *what* religious life is to be today so that it can do Christ's work tomorrow.

In the present moment each community can and does answer that question for itself, believing in its own graceful origins and hoping that it can respond to its own calling. Since we can be most certain about the past and least certain about the future, the most that any prophet of religious life can do is to show clearly what religious life cannot be at present, by reflecting on those things that are unacceptable from the past. This Fr. McNaspy has done very well. We are sure now that religious life does not depend on some magical initiation and training that will produce the ideal religious; religious life is not "prayers without prayer," is not the "pomp and circumstance of another age," is not legalism or a stifling mass of "traditions." In thus clearing the grounds, we are indebted to the author for putting the challenge to each community and congregation to answer with all due speed the question of what the religious life is to be.

FRANCIS P. VALENTINO, S.J.

CHURCH AGAINST ITSELF

The Church Against Itself. *By Rosemary Ruether.* New York: Herder and Herder, 1698. Pp. 245. $5.50.

IT IS PROBABLY A SIGN of the theological malaise of our times that Rosemary Ruether's book has not met with the explosive reception that should be accorded a scholarly work, which "satisfies one's instinct to go to the jugular vein of the institutional church" (Daniel Callahan). Her book represents the kind of original brilliance which

generates controversy on the level of Bishop Robinson's *Honest to God*, without the latter's syncretism and over-popularization. Her thesis is direct and unmistakable: the institutionalized Church must be toppled, in order to maintain the true tradition of the Gospel which encompasses the primitive, apostolic faith. Dr. Ruether pursues this thesis by a ruthlessly methodical rigor, which is all the more persuasive because of her masterful control of sources. She persists in asserting that, insofar as the early eschatological community of the Church bedded down in history, its innate tendency as a "fallen, objective being" was to "banish the gospel and make the endless perpetuation of its own material culture its primary commitment" (237). Earlier in her book, she writes: "The road from the preaching of Jesus to the church might well, from a certain perspective, be called 'history's greatest anti-climax', for it is a road from a moment of ecstatic eschatological expectation to its supposed appropriation but actual negation in an institutional and hierarchical system" (52).

By such shaking of ecclesial foundations, Dr. Ruether calls into question almost every truth of faith upon which the average Christian grounds his belief. The primacy of the Pope, the reduction of historical beliefs into dogmatic formulations, the structure of the episcopacy—all these realities in the contemporary Church, she claims, are a result of its progressive arrogance of power, its abusive sense of absolutizing its relative and fallible structures. "Stone cathedrals, jewelled monstrances, and infallible doctrine," she writes "are false reflections of the value and fidelity of God," and represent a "sinful mode of preciousness and longevity" (236). She insists that the cultural forms of the church can reflect their faith in God "to the extent that they can freely recognize the fallibility and ephemerality of themselves as expressions of it" (236).

Faith for her becomes a kind of Carmelite *nada*, an astringent heroism of the spirit which continually faces the "creative void." One wonders whether Dr. Ruether would permit this church of hers, which lives dialectically between the "already" of this world and the "not yet" of the Kingdom, the right to pause and reflect its self-awareness in some kind of crystallized creed. The direction of her critique indicates that such a manifesto of faith would be still another form of institutional idolotry.

For Rosemary Ruether there is this "irreversible discontinuity between apostolic Christianity and all subsequent Christian tradition" (88). By thus denouncing as spurious all forms of institutionalized Christianity, she lays the groundwork for an ecumenism which cuts

across the established church with its proliferating, denominational differences. She believes that a new church, guided by the Spirit, is emerging with its own special liturgy which celebrates the great secular events of our age: civil rights, the peace movement, etc. One may still remain a Catholic, a Presbyterian, a Quaker, but for the *illuminati* of this new church, such epithets are purely gratuitous, suggesting mere tribal affinity. It is no longer a question of what denomination has preserved intact the virginal purity of the apostolic principle. All traditions have equally prostituted themselves; each is partial, segmental, and in that sense, heretical. For Dr. Ruether, Rome is not home.

Devastating assault

Rosemary Ruether's most devastating assault upon the institutionalized Church on a grassroots' level is directed against the ordained priesthood. She writes that nowhere does Saint Paul speak of the power to forgive sins or consecrate as "a special ministry, for truly this is the ministry of love proper to all Christians by virtue of their ecclesial existence. The words *priest* or *priesthood* in the New Testament are never used for a special group in the Church . . . but either for Christ or for the whole people" (184). Dr. Ruether asserts that it is divisive of community to polarize the Church into active and passive members. She adds that "the power to baptize, to forgive, and to do eucharist is inherent in the ecclesial existence of every baptized and believing person" (185). Priests are simply designated by the Church as the "normal ministers" of the sacraments, but "all Christians may, if the occasion arises, perform these acts of ecclesial existence publicly" (185).

This section is perhaps the most striking and revolutionary part of her book, for she has kicked away the last two remaining props which might have sustained an essentialist's definition of the priest *qua* priest. She refuses to locate the distinctive character of the priest in the performance of certain hieratic functions, because then the church must consequently divide into forgivers and forgiven, consecrators and consecrated, preachers and hearers, thus fatally distorting the reciprocal balance of *koinonia* (fellowship) and *diakonia* (ministry), which ordains that all Christians be both givers and receivers. Dr. Ruether has no need of ecclesiastical leadership of any kind; the community which nourishes and sustains the Christian is where two or more are gathered in a context of creative love which permits human life to become more human. This community has "no apparent outer form, but it is there, nevertheless, wherever bridges are built and men touch each other" (215). She is, in short, totally sceptical on both an historical and existential level of the visible credibility of the institutionalized Church. All

attempts to legitimize the institution are ultimately shallow and futile, in the words of Wallace Stevens, "notes toward a supreme fiction."

For those readers of theology who enjoy the heady brilliance of original thought heightened by a polite anger against the institutional Church, Rosemary Ruether's book, *The Church Against Itself,* should provide hours of subtle release and quiet satisfaction. I should think that it would take an ecclesiologist of the stature of Hans Küng or Avery Dulles to debate her use of sources, especially in determining how much she manipulates them to appease some private vendetta of her own. My greatest difficulty with her approach was its apparent failure to come to grips fully with the Incarnation: to accept that through a very fallible human history, the Divine continues to make its entry. For if, as she asserts, there has been this glaring hiatus between the apostolic church and *all* successive Christian tradition, what then are we to make of the Lord's promise to be with us all days? Has Christ been on sabbatical leave? If Yahweh, the God of Promises, took on flesh in the person of Jesus in order to show man what it truly means to transcend his petty atavism and be fully human, should it then seem so incredible that this same human God should continue to remain incarnate in His sinful, historical, visible Body, the Church?

I am not trying here to whitewash the Church's failures by making a mystique out of her past sins. Certainly Dr. Ruether's incisive book does some needed surgery on the Church's history. But there *is* a difference between biopsy and autopsy. I would much prefer to take my cue from Fr. Daniel Berrigan, who eloquently pleads from compassion toward the Church in his autobiographical essay, *The World Showed Me Its Heart*; he writes, " . . . I know that Christ is in His Church; even though silenced, or put to shame, or drowned out by cynicism or politics or cowardice, 'I am with you all days'. At times, it becomes heroically difficult to find Him there, and to testify to His presence. . . . But I know infallibly that He is there, and that even the worst of us will never succeed in performing the murderous surgery that would amputate Him from His own body."

Joseph F. Roccasalvo, S.J.